REPRESENTATIONS OF MOHAWK & NATIVE HISTORIES IN HIGH SCHOOL TEXTBOOKS

A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF ENGLISH-LANGUAGE & MOHAWK TEXTBOOKS IN QUEBEC

Angela Briscoe

A Thesis

In

The Department

Of

Sociology & Anthropology

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
For the Degree of Master of Arts (Sociology) at
Concordia University
Montreal, Quebec, Canada

December 2005

Your file Votre référence
ISBN: 0-494-14215-4
Our file Notre référence
ISBN: 0-494-14215-4

ABSTRACT

Representations of Mohawk & Native Histories in High School Textbooks: A Comparative Analysis of English-Language & Mohawk Textbooks in Quebec

Angela Briscoe

The study is a qualitative, explorative analysis of historical discourses used in education, borrowing theoretical and methodological principles from critical discourse analysis, conflict theory, critical pedagogy, and multicultural education. From a concern with socio-political relations and education, the overall research objective is to identify and articulate differences between Native and non-Native approaches to secondary level education about the history of Native peoples in Quebec and Canada. In addition to the frameworks of critical discourse analysis and conflict theory, this research is also grounded in the theoretical frameworks advanced by Native scholars and postmodern theorists concerned with methodological and epistemological issues affecting Native historiography and social science research. The analysis compares the Mohawk historical discourses in the Kahnawake Survival School's *Seven Generations* text, with those in *Diverse Pasts*, the English-language text approved for Secondary IV history education in the province of Quebec. The analysis points to the importance of discourses on sovereignty, nationhood and territory within *Seven Generations*, as well as explanations of the basis and rationale for the claims of the Mohawk and other Native nations in North America. The discourses on Mohawk, Iroquois and Native peoples – particularly with respect to sovereignty, nationhood and territory - are analyzed in each text to compare how they are represented and the implications of those representations for the overall education of both Mohawk and non-Native youth in Quebec.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my special thanks to the Kahnawake Survival School staff and to each of the people from Kahnawake and Kanehsatake who contributed their time and knowledge to the development of this work. I would also like to thank everyone from the Ministère de l'éducation du Québec who provided assistance and support for this research.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

You have the mineral wealth of Canada, the wheat lands of the middle west, the forest wealth of the interior, oil fields and fertile valleys. You set aside thousands of acres to preserve the wild game of America, the national parks, but lo - the Indian, you aim to deny him, if possible, the right to live his own life on his reservation, the right to govern his own people in a true democratic way as the Iroquois were governed for years before the white man came to our shores. The Iroquois Indian's appeal is not for mercy. We ask for justice from this great Canadian people, the right to live unmolested in a land that is our heritage. Are we to be exiles in our own country? Is the trust that our forefathers had in the great White Father at Ottawa to be broken?

From the testimonial submission of the St. Regis Band to the Indian Act Review Committee, June 1947

CHAPTER 1: Overview & Research Context

Introduction

The appeal of the St. Regis Band to the Indian Act Review Committee is a poignant example of the importance of history to the Mohawk nation and to other Native peoples across Canada and North America. Today, almost sixty years after the St. Regis petition was advanced, Native people and political leaders in Canada continue to struggle to control a range of local institutions and resources which, although they have been dramatically limited by processes of colonization, remain critical to the perpetuation and prosperity of Native cultures and societies. Historical discourses among Native peoples in the mass media, the arts, education, literature and research often emphasize grievances about the legacy of inhumane treatment at the hands of governments, and about the monopolization of lands and resources for settlements and industries. They also tend to assert and affirm Native peoples' rights of self-determination and of prior occupancy, urging the rest of Canada to recognize these historical realities.

The fact that the St. Regis Band submission was included in the social studies textbook to teach Mohawk youth at the Kahnawake Survival School, and the unlikelihood of seeing it included in a provincial textbook for Quebec, suggests that there are significant differences in the content and aims of history education in the mainstream and Mohawk education systems of the province.

Within the social sciences and humanities, a great deal of research and theoretical work has focused on exploring the relationship between education and social relations, and more specifically the roles of curriculum and pedagogy in the reproduction and transformation of inequalities between groups. This body of research, which will be discussed at length in the chapters that follow, forms the basis of an understanding of education as a fundamentally political sphere of social life, with its practices and

institutions serving to legitimate and perpetuate social and historical inequalities. Although the negative reproduction of power relations in education may be inadvertent in many instances, in the case of Native peoples in Canada education has been willfully used in efforts to assimilate Native populations into the dominant Canadian culture by eroding the continuity of their family structures, languages, and social systems. For this reason, the Mohawk and other Native nations have sought for decades to take the education of their youth back into their own hands. *Indian Control of Indian Education* (1972) is a policy paper which has emerged as a catalyst and focal point for change. It has led to mechanisms by which Native peoples across Canada have begun to reclaim the cultures, heritages, languages, and histories that have been denied them through decades of residential schooling.

A premise of this research is that history education is particularly important to this reclamation because it is the subject that aims to teach students about where their ancestors have come from to arrive at the present day, which in turn conditions the realm of possibilities that students can envision for the future. In a summary of findings from The Estates General on Education, 1995-1996, *The State of Education in Québec*, the MEQ stated the following about the importance of history:

> According to representatives of the cultural milieu, history is the subject most likely to give students a better understanding of their roots, make them aware of the value of their heritage and open their minds to international realities. Many students shared this opinion. As one person said, "To know where we're going, we have to know where we come from". (Gouvernement du Québec, 2001)

The Kahnawake Combined School Committee shares this vision of the role of history education in connecting the experiences of the past to the potential of the future, stating that "unless Mohawk people fast become familiar with the chronology of events that have shaped their past, the very survival of the Mohawk Nation is at stake" (Blanchard, 1980: vii). Although the two educational systems appear to share this

common philosophy on the contribution of history education to the future of society, this study reveals the extent to which the broader philosophical and political orientations of textbook content are at odds in the two educational approaches. Historically, and still to a lesser extent today, mainstream history textbooks have asserted the primacy of the status quo by legitimating the conquest of sovereign nations through a range of discursive patterns, including Eurocentric and often racist discourses of moral and cultural superiority; through discourses that exalt the benefits of progress and development; or through the absence of discourses on issues of critical importance to Native peoples in Canada. Young Native people can not see their communities' histories reflected in those accounts. This is primarily because history curriculum has tended to posit European perspectives and experiences as the central foci from which examination proceeds, and has portrayed colonialism as an epic tale of western civilization. This depiction is necessarily positive, in spite of its tragedies, because it has brought us to our current state of modernity.

Research Overview

The overall aim of this research is to identify and articulate some of the differences between Native and western approaches to studying and teaching history. These issues are examined by comparing the Mohawk historical discourses in *Seven Generations,* the English language text used at the Kahnawake Survival School, with *Diverse Pasts*, the text approved for use in Quebec's Anglophone secondary schools. This study analyzes how colonial processes are represented differently in the discourses of the texts used in a Mohawk run high school established as part of the movement toward Native people controlling the education of their youth, and in the mainstream English secondary education system of Quebec.

This thesis asks four central questions: What discourses are used to teach Mohawk youth about historical events? What are the main characteristics and principles of the historical discourses presented in the Mohawk text? Are those discourses also represented in the English-language history textbook for Quebec high schools? And, finally, how might changes be made in the content of the English-language provincial textbook to include Mohawk self-representations of their communities' histories?

In the preliminary stages of this examination, it quickly became clear that two central discourses run through the *Seven Generations* text: discourses on nationhood and/or sovereignty, and discourses on territorial claims. Thus, particular analytic attention has been given to the discursive representations of sovereignty and territory in both *Seven Generations* and *Diverse Pasts*. These two discourses are prioritized for the analysis because the purpose is to take Mohawk historical representations as a point of departure, i.e. as the basis for elaborating an analytical framework. This is related to the need for social science research to reflect Native peoples' interests and concerns, rather than imposing external research priorities and agendas.[1]

The loss of political autonomy (sovereignty) and control of lands and resources (territory) has been linked to the loss of economic self-sufficiency and the suppression of cultural practices for Native peoples in Canada and Indigenous peoples around the world (UNESCO, 1996: 2). This has in turn produced a wide range of social problems related to poverty and marginalization, which many have argued are the continued legacy of colonialism (Comeau & Santin, 1990; Dickason, 1992; Frideres, 1993; Richardson, 1989; Satzewich & Wotherspoon, 2000; York, 1990). A theoretical premise of this research is that the Quebec education system can contribute to transforming the cycle of colonization by including Native peoples' perspectives of the history of the

[1] See Chapter 3 for further discussion of ethical and methodological issues.

province and the country. The Mohawk and other nations of the Iroquois Confederacy have played an important role in the history of northeastern Canada and the United States, and arguably North America and the world more generally, one which should be represented in a manner that is more reflective of their own historical perspectives and grievances.

Mohawk students would benefit from recognizing their communities and families in the textbook content, making their educational experience more inclusive and relevant. And non-Native students would benefit from the exposure to multiple cultural perspectives, increasing not only their sensitivity and understanding, but also potentially their motivation for social inquiry and engagement vis-à-vis the complex issues of coexistence between Native and non-Native societies in North America. This view follows from work in the field of multicultural education and critical pedagogy, discussed further in Chapter 2. This study is a qualitative, explorative analysis of Mohawk historical discourses, employing the theoretical and methodological principles of critical discourse analysis, conflict theory, critical pedagogy, and multicultural education. In addition to the theoretical frameworks advanced within critical discourse analysis and conflict theory, this research is also grounded in the theoretical frameworks advanced by Native scholars and post-modern theorists concerned with methodological and epistemological issues affecting historiography and the social sciences more generally.

An important premise of this study is that Mohawk historical discourses differ from those of the mainstream education system, and that those differences contribute to continued conflicts and misunderstandings between Native and non-Native Quebecers. The analysis demonstrates that *Seven Generations* systematically employs the concepts of nationhood, sovereignty and worldview as a basis for understanding the history of the Kanienkehaka and their dealings with Europeans, whereas *Diverse Pasts* presents

inconsistent representations of Native peoples as nations, reserves the issue of sovereignty to the French Canadian struggle under the British, and provides little explanation of the role of worldview in the history of relations between nations. And while *Seven Generations* discursively constructs historical chronology as a continuous narrative made up of relatively detailed accounts of actions, events and decisions of great historical significance in terms of their impact on the Kanienkehaka (very often using primary sources), the discourses used in *Diverse Pasts* construct chronology as a series of historical periods marked by particular events in some cases, but more characterized by broad-based changes and general trends. Chronology is also discursively treated as a subject of study in *Diverse Pasts*, as a learning objective for students to attain the analytical skills to create timelines and understand the transitions between major historical periods.

Terminology

The terms *Native*, *Iroquois*, and *Mohawk* or *Kanienkehaka* have been used in this thesis for the sake of consistency with the language of the two texts being analyzed. Both *Seven Generations* and *Diverse Pasts* refer to Native people and to the Iroquois consistently throughout their pages. *Diverse Pasts* uses the term Mohawk, which *Seven Generations* also uses, but interchangeably with Kanienkehaka which is used more frequently. While the term *Native* is used to refer to the original peoples of Canada and North America, *Indigenous* is used to refer to the international collective of colonized nations or peoples[2]. The terms *nations* and *peoples* are used interchangeably, and are defined here as the collectivities that share a distinct combination of language,

[2] The term "Indigenous peoples" emerged in the 1970s to articulate the mobilization of colonized peoples as an international political movement led by the activism of the American Indian Movement and the Canadian Indian Brotherhood (Smith, 1999: 7)

epistemology, social and political organization, history, geography, and cultural practices and symbols[3].

Given the problem of essentialism and generalizations in the representation of cultural difference, it is important to recognize that there are limits to the general statements that can be made about Native, Iroquois, and Kanienkehaka or Mohawk peoples as unified, coherent groups. For example, there are political divisions within Native nations that stem from a range of differences, including religion, class and gender (Alfred, 1995; Sunseri, 2000). The critique of essentialism and the limits of identity categories have been considered at great length by social theorists with a range of foci, including gender, sexuality, and race (Butler, 1993; Epstein, 1987; Gilroy, 1999; Martin, 1988). The problem of essentialism is addressed in this research by recognizing that there is no single "Mohawk" historical account. *Seven Generations* is one of several possible Mohawk representations of historical events, just as there is no single "mainstream" account. Furthermore, within both there are the complexities of multiple discourses at work. The Mohawk account presented in *Seven Generations* is one of many, and it is particularly reflective of the interests and concerns of traditional people in the community of Kahnawake, as suggested by the history of the school and the production of the text (discussed further below).

My working definition of *discourse* is taken from Fairclough (2003) in his work on critical discourse analysis. He distinguishes between discourse and discourses, referring to the former as a genre of textual or linguistic social practice, and the latter, which concerns my work on Mohawk discourses, as "diverse representations of social life which are inherently positioned – differently positioned social actors 'see' and represent social life in different ways, different discourses" (2003: 206). This reflects the

[3] This is my own definition, which is informed from a vast range of sources. It is not intended to be an exhaustive definition.

multitude of Mohawk historical discourses that exist based on the diversity of perspectives and experiences.

The concept of power that is used herein is best reflected in the concept of social power articulated by Teun A. van Dijk, who identifies a number of principles of power relations which are pertinent to the current study:

> ... Social power is defined in terms of the *control* exercised by one group or organisation (or its members) over the *actions* and/or the *minds* of (the members of) another group, thus limiting the freedom of action of the others, or influencing their knowledge, attitudes, or ideologies ... Social power and dominance are often *organised* and *institutionalized,* so as to allow more effective control, and to enable routine forms of power reproduction ... Dominance is seldom absolute; it is often *gradual,* and may be met by more or less *resistance* or counter-power by dominated groups (1996: 84-85)

The attention given to the role of power in shaping minds and knowledge is of particular concern in the current study of pedagogical materials as sites of power because it is of direct relevance to the function of education in society.

Another important conceptual and terminological concern is the representation of groups that are commonly described as 'marginalized' or 'oppressed'. Wherever possible, these groups are referred to as *bicultural groups.* The concept of biculturalism is used by Antonia Darder as an alternative to writing about 'minority' students, which she considers to be "a term that linguistically, and hence politically, reflects and perpetuates a view of subordinate cultures as deficient and disempowered" (1991: xvi). The concept of biculturalism refers to the experience of students who are required to be skilled in both their birth culture and that of the 'mainstream', which Darder identifies as Anglo-American (ibid.). However, it is important to note that biculturalism is not restricted to ethnicity; it may be experienced by anyone outside of the white, heterosexual, and able-bodied majority in Canadian or North American society. The concept of biculturalism corresponds with the views of Native Elders in Canada, who maintain that in order for Native peoples to "survive as Indian people," they must

become bicultural, proficient in the languages, traditions, technologies and values of both Native and mainstream Canadian cultures (Couture, 1985).

Related to the issues of marginalization and biculturalism is the concept of colonization and colonized peoples. Colonization is understood here to refer to processes beyond the basic European practice of settling lands and developing societies in North America.[4] It is also the process by which European settlement uprooted and forcibly reorganized the existing social, political and economic systems that were in place in Native societies. That said, however, it is important to point out that references in this thesis to the Mohawk or other nations having been "colonized" are not meant to be synonymous with them having been "conquered". Native people were colonized in that their lands, social systems, political organizations and cultural expressions were dramatically altered by the establishment of colonies in the Americas. However, the history of treaties and agreements (or lack thereof) between European and Native nations points to the fact that Native peoples continue to exist as nations with protected rights which are increasingly recognized and affirmed, both domestically in Canada and in the international arena (Assembly of First Nations & Government of Canada, 2005; Center For World Indigenous Studies, 1999; Government of Canada, 2005).

The concepts of discourse, power, biculturalism and colonization are each central to the theoretical and analytical approach employed herein to consider the implications of textbook representations for the reproduction and transformation of social relations between Native and non-Native Canadians and Quebecers. The concepts of discourse and power are further elaborated in Chapter 3, but these broader terminological issues, which are also political issues in the context of this research, are important to address at the outset to make their intended meaning explicit.

[4] A preliminary review of Quebec's English- and French-language history textbooks revealed this to be the most common explanation and/or definition of colonization provided.

Kahnawake Community Context

The community of Kahnawake is located fifteen kilometres from Montreal, Quebec on the St-Lawrence River. The land base is 12,000 acres, which includes the Kahnawake Reserve as well as the Doncaster Reserve near Ste-Agathe, Quebec, which is shared with the Mohawk community of Kanehsatake (Alfred, 1995: 2-3). Kahnawake Mohawks also claim ownership of the Seigneurie de Sault St. Louis, another 24,000 acres of land on the eastern border of the Kahnawake Reserve, which is currently occupied by non-Native municipalities (ibid.). As in many Native communities, the population of Kahnawake is mobile, with many community members taking up residence elsewhere for purposes such as work and education while keeping a "permanent home" in Kahnawake (Alfred, 1995: 195-6, n3).

The per capita income of the community in 1995[5] was $30,000 (among the highest in Canada for Native communities), with two thirds of the community's income coming from government transfers, 20% from off-reserve salaries, 13% from local businesses, and 1% from investment income[6] (Alfred, 1995: 2-3). The community's institutions include Kateri Memorial Hospital, the Mohawk Survival School, the Karonhianónhnha School for Mohawk language immersion, three Longhouses, and a range of health, legal, economic and social services, for which the community has "reassumed authority" through governing boards made up of diverse community members (ibid.). Kahnawake also has a local radio, newspaper, and bookstore (ibid.).

The Kahnawake Band Council was established in 1992 (Smith, 1993: 20). The Mohawk Council of Kahnawake (MCK) consists of an elected Grand Chief, eleven elected council members, and an Executive Committee (Alfred, 1995: 2-3). The MCK

[5] More recent census data was not available through Statistics Canada.
[6] Alfred points out that these figures do not include revenues from underground economic activities.

controls administration and finances but the Longhouses are vested with authority as social, cultural, and political institutions by a "significant minority" of traditionalists in the Mohawk community (ibid.). Divisions between traditionalists and supporters of the band council system, as well as along other lines of difference, have been the source of tensions and conflict in both Kahnawake and Kanehsatake, manifesting in many areas of public life including citizenship, economic development, governance, policing, and land claims negotiations (Deer, 1994; Diabo, 1995; Dickson-Gilmore, 1999; Mohawk Nation News, 1998; York & Pindera, 1991: 50-51). Fundamental to many of the debates and divisions are concerns about the best way to ensure the long-term viability of the community and the nation. Gerald Alfred argues that the MCK now constitutes an institution that, while functioning within the parameters of the federal Indian Act system, is managed as "an instrument of Mohawk self-government" (1995: 5). Both Kahnawake and Kanehsatake have a combination of band council and traditional Longhouse governance models.

The community of Kahnawake was established as a primarily Christian Mohawk community set apart from other groups in the Mohawk Valley, which can be considered a manifestation of what Alfred refers to as a "traditional pattern of Mohawk factional politics" (1995: 33). According to one resident of the community, Kahnawake was created as a Native Christian community in the mid-1600's as a 'haven' for those who had converted to Christianity. Converts were viewed with suspicion by those Mohawks who had continued with traditional ways, so they created their own community. According to this resident, as recently as the 1960s and 1970s, Kahnawake was "still very Christian"[7].

Whereas the Great Law of Peace contains provisions for consensus-based conflict resolution in instances of competing forms of political authority, it does not

[7] Interview conducted in Kahnawake on December 15, 2004.

provide mechanisms to resolve religious divisions, such as arose from the assimilation of Christian Hurons into the Mohawk population (ibid.). Ultimately, religion combined with geo-political and economic interests to instigate the Mohawk migration to Kentaké, the French Jesuit settlement which attracted Indian Christians seeking refuge from persecution, including the Mohawks now living in Kahnawake (ibid.: 35-36). According to the historical account in *Seven Generations,* the Mohawk people moved to Kahnawake in 1676 when they left Kentaké to escape discrimination and thefts by French residents (Blanchard, 1980: 160).

The same respondent recounted some of the stories told by parents and uncles about life in Kahnawake from circa 1870 to 1970. During this time, an Indian agent represented the community in Ottawa, and the government and Indian agents ran the reserves. According to the respondent, the objective of the Indian Act was to assimilate the Mohawk people, and the RCMP was posted in the community to enforce the objectives of the Indian agent and the federal government.[8] The philosophy of the religious institutions in Kahnawake was also that of assimilation, and the church administrators worked independently of the government but toward the same goals. Things began to change in the 1970s when Native people had more room to move freely and the government eventually phased out the Indian agent's position on reserves by 1975. In addition, the RCMP was less present in communities by 1968 when the Caughnawaga Iroquois Police were established, which are today known as the Kahnawake Peacekeepers. The establishment of the MCK also provided the community with more autonomy.

[8] It is widely accepted among Native people and scholars of Native history that the Indian Act aimed to assimilate Native peoples by subjecting them to the regulations of the Canadian system of law, such as the implementation of the band council system to replace traditional systems of governance, through the loss of Indian status for women who intermarried, and through the regulation of Native education to ensure that all young people attended Canadian schools. These are only a few examples of how the policy forced integration into the Canadian social system.

This respondent felt that these improvements in Native peoples' rights to govern their own affairs were the result of changes in social and political attitudes, and the education of Canadians about the historical context of Native peoples' place within Canada and North America. Although anecdotal, this explanation supports the view that education has an important role to play in shaping public views on Native issues and political struggles. By consequence, the importance of education in shaping future generations also explains the strong desire of Native peoples to control the education of their youth, both as a protective measure against the racism and ignorance encountered in mainstream schools and as an assertion of cultural and political autonomy. Indeed, along with the increased autonomy that came from the removal of the Indian agent and the new mechanism for local government in Kahnawake, the important changes came with the establishment of Mohawk-run schools on reserve.

A predecessor to the Survival School was the Indian Way School, a high school founded in 1969 by the traditionalist community in Kahnawake and run through the Longhouse (Blanchard, 1980: 465). The Kahnawake Survival School was founded in 1978 as an act of resistance to Bill 101, Quebec's French-language legislation governing the language of education of Quebec students (ibid.: vii). The Mohawk resistance to Bill 101 relates also to the current political context in which Mohawk and other Native peoples object to the legal-political recognition of the French as founding nations with rights of cultural distinction that have not been equally extended to Native nations in Canada.[9] This is consistent with the ongoing importance placed on sovereignty in the historical discourses reviewed here. In order to fulfill its commitment to Mohawk education for the youth of Kahnawake, the school established the Center for Curriculum

[9] Based on contacts with Native people across Canada through work in the federal government, there is evidence that many Native Canadians are resentful that French has official language status while Indigenous languages in Canada have been ranked third among the world's most endangered languages (UNESCO, 1996).

Development, whose first publication was *Seven Generations: A History of the Kanienkehaka*, a testament to the importance of history education in the reclamation of culturally relevant education.

CHAPTER 2: Education For & About Native Peoples

"Indian Control of Indian Education"

A number of scholarly and community-based publications have outlined the vast impact of colonization on the lives of individuals and communities, which has left a mark on all areas including justice, health, education, family, economics, and citizenship[10]. However, Native peoples' struggles in Canada have made important advances in the past several decades which have afforded them increased control over their social, cultural and economic development as communities. While Native peoples have suffered cultural losses as a result of residential schooling, relocations and centralizations of communities, and other federal policies, there is a growing body of work that calls into question the assumption that they have "lost" their cultures and traditions. Aboriginal scholars are particularly apt to remind readers that their cultures and communities remain strong, vibrant, and distinctively Native (Alfred, 1995; Sioui, 1992). It is this resilience and commitment to the principles of self-determination that underlies Native peoples struggles to reclaim the education of their youth.

The policy paper *Indian Control of Indian Education* was published in 1972 by the National Indian Brotherhood as a response to the federal government's 1969 White Paper, which proposed transferring responsibility for Native education to the provinces (Battiste, 1995: viii). The publication formalized what came to be a national position on Native education in response to the removal of children from their communities and the use of education as a means of assimilation with residential schooling. Beginning with the community of Blue Quills, Alberta in 1970, Native communities across Canada have been reclaiming control of the education of their youth (Dickason, 1992: 337). Today,

---

[10] For general overviews of the issues see Comeau & Santin, 1990; Frideres, 1993; Richardson, 1989; and York, 1990. For a detailed historical discussion see Dickason, 1992. For a detailed discussion of education, see Battiste, 1995; Satzewich & Wotherspoon, 2000; Schissel & Wotherspoon, 2003.

Native communities in Quebec have much more influence over what and how their youth learn, and many have produced their own history and social studies textbooks, such as *Seven Generations* in Kahnawake (Blanchard, 1980), *Since Time Immemorial: "Our Story"* in Maniwaki (McGregor, 2004), and *A History of Quebec and Canada* in northern communities served by the Cree school board (Faries, 2002).

The content of these texts reflect an approach to history articulated by Huron-Wendat historian Georges Sioui in his work on Amerindian *autohistory*, which he describes as "the study of correspondences between Amerindian and non-Amerindian sources" (1992: xxii). Sioui uses this historical method to advance the thesis that contrary to the popular historical conception of Native societies and cultures disappearing from contact with European civilization, colonialism was actually a process of "Americization" of the world through the adoption and transmission of Native philosophies and values. This understanding has also been argued by other scholars writing about the contributions of Native peoples to contemporary North American social and political cultures (Cohen, 1952; Grinde, 1991; Johansen, 1998; Lyons et al., 1992; Newhouse et al., 2005; Weatherford, 1992).

However, this is not the most commonly held understanding of the events of history and the impacts of colonization. Much more widespread is the awareness that the establishment of European societies transformed those of Native peoples, and that the Canadian government has used a range of strategies to assimilate and integrate Natives into the mainstream of the dominant society and its institutions, as in the case of education policy throughout the past two centuries.

Residential Schooling: Education for Assimilation

The belief that education is essential to the transmission and reproduction of values, ideologies, and modes of social existence was the cornerstone of the federal policy vision that led to the establishment of residential schools for Native youth across Canada. According to Métis historian Olive Patricia Dickason,

> The intensity and duration of the campaign to capture Indian minds and hearts reflects the importance accorded to this aspect of nation-building. Control of education goes to the heart of the movement for self-government, a battle Canada fought with Great Britain in the nineteenth century, as Amerindians are waging it with Canada today. (1992: 338)

Colonial efforts to control the education of young Native people have a long history in Canada. The first attempts to provide European education to Native children were boarding schools in New France in the 1620's and 1670's but these attempts at assimilation into French culture and religion were unsuccessful (Miller, 1996). There were no major initiatives by the British during the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries because of their reliance on Native peoples' traditional skills for subsistence and as military and diplomatic allies (ibid.: 61-62). However, with declining military importance in the mid-nineteenth century and the shift of government responsibility for Native peoples to civilian authorities, there was increased emphasis on religious conversion and assimilation efforts (ibid.: 62-63).

Youth from the communities of Kahnawake and Kanehsatake attended English schools in Ontario. The Mohawk Institute in Brantford, Ontario was one of the first four schools established in the residential school system, serving primarily the Mohawk community of Six Nations. However, in 1965 there were also over one hundred students enrolled from Quebec, although it is not clear what proportion of these students were Mohawk, as reference is made to students from remote communities in Quebec and northern Ontario (Milloy, 1999: 204-05).

The federally-run residential school system was in operation from 1879 to 1996 (Indian Residential Schools Resolution Canada, 2005; Milloy, 1999: 52). Along with residential schools, Native children also attended boarding schools and industrial schools across the country. The former taught general education in language, math, and home economics, and the latter operated as large-scale trade schools. In both cases, the vision was to train students to work in agricultural production, to be productive contributors to the Canadian economy, and to lead the way for Native people to become "civilized" (Milloy, 1999).

While honouring treaty commitments (where they existed) to provide for the schooling of Native youth, there is reason to believe that the philosophy at the heart of the schools was often opposed to the spirit of treaty agreements as they were understood by Native peoples. One example of an alternate understanding of the agreement lies in the Federation of Saskatchewan Indians' pamphlet entitled *Indian Treaty Rights,* which states that the purpose of the schools was "to preserve Indian life, values, and Indian Government authority" as Native communities adapted to the conditions of co-existence with other Canadians (Dickason, 1992: 333 n49). This view of the purpose of Native education in Canada as adaptation – not assimilation - was also shared by Garden River Ojibwa Chief Augustine Shingwauk. He sought to foster success among the Ojibwa equal to that of the British, who he spoke of in terms of "how great and how powerful ... how rapid their advance, and how great their success in every work to which they put their hands" (Miller, 1996: 5). According to J. R. Miller, Shingwauk's vision of a 'teaching wigwam' was a "strategy that the Ojibwa of Garden River had developed for adjusting to the new Euro-Canadian society" (ibid.: 4-5).

However, instead of supporting the transmission of skills and knowledge so that Native peoples could adopt and integrate them in a way that was socially and culturally appropriate to them, the school system administered by both the federal government

and various religious denominations across Canada was designed to assimilate Native peoples and exterminate their cultures over the course of generations. The policy of assimilation was implemented in part by immersing Native youth in the practices of Christianity and non-Native economic activities, but more importantly through the rejection and prohibition of Native cultural expression. This manifested through the racist attitudes of teachers and administrators, the punishing of students for speaking their Native languages and practicing their culture, and the disruption of social systems through the forced separation of children from their families (Dickason, 1992: 333-37; Knockwood, 1992; Milloy, 1999: 183).

In addition to the assimilative and paternalistic philosophy underlying the schools' missions, the residential school system was flawed and damaging to Native communities because of the widespread lack of resources invested. The schools operated within chronic conditions of shortage, inadequacy, and inhumanity where supplies, facilities, and treatment of students were concerned (Knockwood, 1992; Milloy, 1999). Ironically, many of the cases of Native enrolment in the schools were justified on the grounds of social welfare, as in the case of eleven youth from Kahnawake (then Caughnawaga) who were sent to the Roman Catholic school at Wikwemikong as a measure to provide for their care following the deaths of their fathers in a bridge accident (Miller, 1996: 313). Yet all of the available evidence suggests that numerous threats to the children's well-being were actually introduced in the schools.

Among the tragedies inflicted by the neglect of government and church officials was the spread of disease among students. This was extensive enough that Duncan Campbell Scott, who had a strong influence on the Department of Indian Affairs' vision and management of the school system, estimated that "fifty percent of the children who passed through these schools did not live to benefit from the education which they had received therein" (Milloy, 1999: 51). Similarly, the Shingwauk residential school in

Ontario, which Mohawk youth from Quebec attended, was condemned in 1931 and, according to analysis of the national archives of the Department of Indian Affairs related to the management of residential schools more generally, "Long lists of repairs from every corner of the system were submitted and ignored, as were pleas for urgent assistance," leading to unliveable conditions and the spread of diseases such as tuberculosis (Milloy, 1999: 104).

Before their eventual closures, both Shingwauk and the Mohawk Institute evolved from operating as Indian residential schools to integrated boarding schools, serving both Native and non-Native students from many different provinces at the elementary and secondary levels. This was a way to salvage the existing infrastructure of the system while continuing to advance the assimilation policy underlying Indian education policy (Milloy, 1999: 204-07; Miller, 1996: 151-216).

During the 1951 review of the Indian Act, policy reforms were made to integrate Native students into mainstream schools, which succeeded in increasing rates of attendance and retention, but were still met with the charge that Native people should not be assimilated into mainstream society or made dependent on its institutions (Dickason, 1992: 336-7). The federal government began efforts to close the schools in the late 1940's because of the evidence of their failure and lack of educational value for Native youth, but in spite of the widespread recognition of the school system's failures, it continued to operate for another four decades with the last Canadian residential school closing in 1988 (Dickason, 1992: 337; Milloy, 1999: 211-12).

There is a legacy of negative impacts within Native communities as a result of entire generations experiencing first-hand the trauma caused by conditions of violence, neglect, disease and cultural suppression that characterized so many residential schools. Today, there are legal actions and government initiatives across Canada aimed at reconciliation and healing for Native peoples, a testament to the extent and severity of

the damages incurred by the school system. According to the Government of Canada, "of the 130 schools that existed, it is estimated that up to 100 of these schools could be involved in lawsuits" (Indian Residential Schools Resolution Canada, 2005). Formal apologies have been made by the United, Anglican, Presbyterian, and Roman Catholic churches of Canada (Ontario Consultants on Religious Tolerance, 2000). In January 1998, the Government of Canada issued a Statement of Reconciliation, which acknowledges and apologizes for its role in developing and administering the educational system in which students were physically and sexually abused. It has also established Indian Residential Schools Resolution Canada and the Aboriginal Healing Foundation to provide legal and social support services to residential school survivors and their families.

Clearly, schools have historically played a horrific role in the physical, mental and emotional lives of Native people in Canada and have been the site of gross injustices and violations of human dignity. But what is also important about the role of schooling more generally in the experience of Native people is the power that education systems wield in shaping public opinion and race relations, all too often with the effect of reinforcing intercultural divisions and misunderstanding, prejudice, and racism.

Textbook Representations of "Indians"

A number of formative North American works in the field of textbook bias and racism in education were published in the 1970's. Researchers examined the ways that "Indians" and other "ethnic" groups were represented in elementary and high school social studies textbooks, concluding that, without exception, textbooks were derogatory and biased in their depictions of the moral character, skills, intelligence, and social contribution of the groups examined (American Indian Historical Society, 1970; McDiarmid & Pratt, 1971;

Vincent & Arcand, 1979). This body of research was part of a call for more value-neutral depictions of groups and historical events, and for less nationalism and cultural bias as a promotion of democratic principles in education (McDiarmid & Pratt, 1971). This body of research was part of a broader trend toward a critical evaluation of curriculum and pedagogy to consider their role in perpetrating white, Anglo-Saxon supremacist attitudes in North American children. This intellectual movement was inspired by the Second World War and the civil rights movement in the sixties (Banks, 2001; McDiarmid & Pratt, 1971). The 1960s and 70s also marked the beginning of the American Indian Movement, involving Native people on both sides of the Canada-US border and raising public awareness about the violence and injustices of colonialism, which likely contributed to the concern with representations of "Indians" and colonialism.

Although it is very common to hear Native Canadians refer to the impact made by history textbooks, there is very little published discussion and analysis of the subject authored by Native people or reflecting their own articulation of the problem. In a review of the existing literature on textbook bias and Native peoples in North America, only one example was found of a Native authored examination of textbook content. In this collection of reviews of social studies texts edited by the American Indian Historical Society, the authors used questionnaires, focus groups and written critiques by various contributors to evaluate textbooks according to nine general criteria (1970: 14-23):

1. Is the history of the American Indian presented as an integral part of the history of America, at every point of this nation's development?
2. Does the text explain that the first discoverers of America were those Native peoples whom Columbus described improperly as "Indians?"
3. Is the data contained in the text accurate?
4. Does the textbook faithfully describe the culture and lifeways of the American Indian at that time in history when the Europeans first came in contact with him?
5. Is the culture of the Indian described as a dynamic process, so that his social system and lifeways are seen as a developmental process, rather than a static one?

6. Are the contributions of the Indians to the Nation and the world described?
7. Does the textbook accurately describe the special position of the American Indian in the history of the United States of America – socially, economically, and politically?
8. Does the textbook describe the religions, philosophies, and contributions to thought, of the American Indian?
9. Does the textbook adequately and accurately describe the life and situation of the American Indian in the world of today?

They found that "Not one [text reviewed] could be approved as a dependable source of knowledge about the history and culture of the Indian people in America" (ibid.: 11).

Similarly, in their quantitative analysis of the content of social studies texts in Ontario, Garnet McDiarmid and David Pratt found that whereas primary level texts for all subjects depicted "Indians" in a positive manner, secondary level texts depicted them either neutrally or negatively and *all* the history texts examined evaluated Indians negatively (1971: 44). The analysis also led them to argue that "the social studies texts used in Ontario schools have tended to evade sensitive issues, particularly in cases where the incidents might cast a poor reflection on the character of those who colonized North America" (ibid.: 55). The content analysis of Ontario's social studies textbooks measured evaluative assertions about various groups as an indicator of the extent and nature of bias in the content. Their work is based on the premise that if textbooks present negative attitudes they are likely to play a role in perpetuating them.

In contrast to McDiarmid and Pratt's quantitative approach, Sylvie Vincent and Bernard Arcand (1979) use a structuralist, semiotic analysis to identify the major traits, characteristics and historical roles assigned to Native peoples in Quebec social studies texts. They conclude that the central message conveyed to students was of the inferiority and difference of Native people vis-à-vis French Canadians. They identified thematic representations of Native peoples as hostile, savage, passive/simple observers of history, manipulated and victimized, primitive, disorganized, nature-loving, and inept in

commerce and war (with the exception of a few unique individuals). They argue that social studies texts instill Quebecois national identity in students through its juxtaposition against Native cultures and societies, which is consistent with more recent scholarship.

An increasingly accepted view is that national histories are social constructions in that they reflect changing social values and attitudes and include certain perspectives and accounts at the expense of others. For example, Stuart Hall argues that national identities and cultures are not natural or transhistorical, *but rather are formed through* representations, including the representations within national histories and the ritualization of historically significant events (2000: 612-13) [11]. Daniel Francis cites Edward Said's statement that "nations *are* narrations" as he sets out to examine what he calls the 'core myths' of Canadian history in his book *National Dreams: Myth, Memory, and Canadian History* (1997: 176, emphasis in original). Francis argues that "core myths are usually the property of the elites, who use them to reinforce the status quo and to further their claims to privilege" (ibid.: 12). Government approved history textbooks, as sites of formal reproduction of the so called 'core myths', are implicated in the process of reinforcing and normalizing the dominance and imposition of Canadian culture and institutions on Native communities.

As well, a number of scholarly publications demonstrate how representations of Native peoples in Canadian historical writing and textbooks have changed over time as their relationships with Euro-Canadians changed (Francis, 1992; Trigger, 1985, 1986; Washburn and Trigger, 1996). Bruce Trigger (1985) also presents a thorough comparative discussion of French and English historians' representations of Native peoples since historiography in Canada first began to include treatment of North America's pre-European occupants. His work shows that French Canadian nationalist

[11] What we learn about national history may come to be internalized as part of a collective identity (Castenell and Pinar, 1993; Francis, 1997; Hall, 1996a), although this internalization most likely occurs to varying degrees and with very different implications depending on one's positioning within society.

historians presented contradictory images of various Native peoples, praising their respective qualities and virtues while showing them to be violent and threatening to colonizers (1985: 29-38). He identifies these contradictions as "ambivalence," describing how this trait occurs in both English and French historiography from 1830 to the mid-twentieth century (ibid.: 29, 39).

This ambivalence of historical writings appears to have filtered down to school textbooks if we consider the discussion of variations in attitudes and discourses on Native people presented by Francis (1992) and by Vincent and Arcand (1979). Indeed, the analysis of *Diverse Pasts* that follows in Chapter 4 also suggests that provincial textbooks continue to demonstrate ambiguity in their portrayals of Native peoples and their role in history.

Critical Education Research: Social Implications of Curriculum & Textbooks

For most scholars writing in the field of multicultural education and curriculum development, education and power relations are taken to be inextricably linked to race-, class-, and gender-based inequalities, including decisions about which knowledge is most important and legitimate for the education of a society's young people (Banks & Banks, 2001; Darder, 1991; Giroux, 1983; McCarthy & Crichlow, 1993; Sleeter & McLaren, 1995; Webster, 1997). Academic research on all levels of education has suggested that oppressive race relations are both reflected in and perpetuated by Eurocentric and upper-middle class bias in approaches to pedagogy, curriculum content, and social relations in schools (Apple, 2002; Dimitriadis & McCarthy, 2001; McCarthy & Crichlow, 1993; Popkewitz, 1991).

The disciplinary distinctions between sociology of education, critical pedagogy, and multicultural education are in some ways artificial, though each of the approaches

have traits that make them unique. Critical pedagogy and multicultural education share a concern with the concepts of voice, power, culture, and ideology (Sleeter and Delgado Bernal, 2004). The sociology of education also shares the concern with these issues, though perhaps less with the concept of "voice" and greater emphasis on class inequalities and the reproduction of social stratification through education. Similarly, critical pedagogy is a school of theory and research that is concerned with the ways in which asymmetrical power relations based on race and class are reproduced within schooling practices, through both curriculum and pedagogy. Its origins lie with the Frankfurt school of critical theory and the seminal work of Paulo Freire, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, both of which were concerned primarily with the issue of class struggle (ibid.). Each of these fields is equally concerned with the relationship between social inequality and educational processes, including pedagogical practices, curriculum development and the production and selection of instructional materials such as textbooks.

Knowledge Production

Daniel Francis presents a compelling argument for the importance of history textbooks, pointing out that "they are the only history books that most people will ever read, and they are among the few places where the story of Canada is written down in black and white" (1997: 14). It is the quality of "black and white" finality that makes textbooks a useful place to analyze the dominant narratives and discourses of a people. Although there is variation among texts, and between texts and people, they are a reliable source for inquiring about how history is taught for cohorts of students using a given text. In Kahnawake, the same text has been used for 25 years which suggests an increased amount of stability and continuity in the discursive forms that young Mohawks have been exposed to over the past three decades.

Although Kahnawake students are fortunate enough to have a textbook developed within their home community, Native peoples are rarely included in the construction of historical texts for consumption by the general population. Among the main reasons for this is that Native peoples are still underrepresented among the university faculty members who tend to author the texts that would inform instructional textbooks, such as ethno-historians and anthropologists (Moore, 1998). Furthermore, those historical sources that have already been produced by Native peoples, which could be used by other historians writing pedagogical texts are largely absent from the bibliographies and research sources.[12] Not only do academics tend to not reference Native authors enough as experts on their own cultures, they also do not use them as resources for information of general historical significance. Therefore, Native writers and thinkers have less access to the social power to shape minds and knowledge. This exemplifies Bourdieu's concern with the operation of power and social reproduction within processes of knowledge production.

The constraints upon Native peoples' access to knowledge production within the domains of academia and publishing pose a serious problem if one accepts Michael Apple's description of textbooks as "the 'real curriculum' in most schools" in that they are used as the basis for lesson planning and the organization of learning modules (1993: 11). The representations provided in textbooks are particularly authoritative and influential for young readers, who may lack the knowledge or awareness to reflect critically on how events and groups are depicted (van Dijk, 1993: 197-198). Not only do textbooks have an important role in determining what is taught to students, but they are also treated as authorities on what constitutes official or formal knowledge by students, parents and teachers (Apple, 1993: 50; O'Connor, 2001: 55; Ross, 2001: 84). An important consideration is that texts are produced within the constraints of economic

[12] For example, the works of Sioui (1992), Alfred (1995) and Dickason (1992).

concerns (Apple, 1993: 46, 49) and textbook authors and publishers may not be compelled to present perspectives of history or other topics that are controversial.

Bourdieu (1971) argues that schools and universities, as agencies of cultural production, produce the content of what is deemed as valid knowledge and they determine who has the power to render knowledge valid, both by evaluating the merit of intellectual work and by producing new generations of intellectuals to produce and evaluate knowledge. He maintains that the system of validation and valorization of knowledge is more important to the reproduction of inequality than is the actual content of that knowledge.

Reproduction of Social Inequality

Some scholars have focused on the notion that schools are institutions that favour students who are already advantaged with respect to gender, class and ethnicity, and which reproduce the skills and values that perpetuate capitalist competition and division of labour (Apple, 1993; Bourdieu, 1971; Bourdieu and Passeron, 1990). Many scholars maintain the importance of curriculum content and didactic materials in the reproduction of relations of dominance and marginalization in western multicultural societies. Contemporary scholars continue to present similar arguments about the biased and oppressive nature of curriculum content and development:

> ... the underlying principles related to both curriculum content and teaching methodology are derived from what is considered to be the function of education in American society: namely, the perpetuation of values and social relations that produce and legitimate the dominant worldview at the expense of a vast number of citizens. (Darder, 1991: 19)

This is reiterated by Aronowitz & Giroux in their discussion of the hidden curriculum which, they argue, operates as part of the dominant school culture to:

> legitimate the interests and values of dominant groups; it also functions to marginalize and disconfirm knowledge forms and experiences that are extremely important to subordinate and oppressed groups. This can be seen

> in the way in which school curricula often ignore the histories of women, racial minorities, and the working class. (1985: 147-8)

The interpretation of history that is reflected in curriculum and textbooks informs how current debates and struggles are perceived by the public, which is an important argument for the inclusion of Native peoples' perspectives in history curriculum. That is not to say that all young minds should be conditioned to support Native claims, but that they should have an educated understanding of the convictions driving the various groups involved in contemporary debates and disputes over rights and resources.

In spite of the arguments presented above about the imposition and reproduction of oppressive relations through educational discourses and representations, it is important to consider the agency of students and teachers. Bicultural students may be more aware of the dynamics of power arising from racial-ethnic, gender and class divisions, and may be less inclined to internalize the legitimacy of "the system" as a result. For example, there is evidence that students whose experiences do not corroborate the knowledge presented in books will reject or question its legitimacy: both students and teachers exercise the ability to reject certain textbook and classroom content, and both groups exercise a degree of discretion and agency in the educational process, rather than being pure receptacles for knowledge (Apple, 2002: 63).

However, to the extent that students accept the content of textbooks and curriculum, the content of that education is still a mechanism for reinforcing structural inequalities by legitimating the existing system. Many students do not yet possess a critical awareness of the political processes that have shaped the content of the knowledge they are taught or the types of critiques that have been developed about that content (Aronowitz & Giroux, 1985: 147; Darder, 1991: 19). Textbooks may influence the teachers responsible for conveying knowledge of a subject to students by providing them with a ready-to-use curriculum resource in which facts have been organized and

issues have been framed. And while students and teachers are interpreters rather than receptacles of knowledge, it is arguable that they can only reject the knowledge or information that is inconsistent with their prior experience or knowledge gained from other information sources. Where history textbooks are concerned, most Québécois teachers and youth do not have an alternate image of Native peoples on which to base a critique of the representations presented.

Transformative Possibilities

In his ground-breaking work *Pedagogy of the Oppressed,* Paulo Freire argues that education should liberate working class students and citizens through *conscientizaçao* - or adopting a 'critical consciousness'. By this he means "learning to perceive social, political, and economic contradictions, and to take action against the oppressive elements of reality" (Freire, 1997: 17n1). He writes that, "Education as the exercise of domination stimulates the credulity of students, with the ideological intent (often not perceived by educators) of indoctrinating them to adapt to the world of oppression" (ibid.: 59). In this thesis, I argue that high school history textbooks play a crucial role in the process of indoctrination described by Freire. As will be suggested in the analysis, *Diverse Pasts* does not encourage students to question contradictions and injustices in its depiction of Native peoples' historical roles, while *Seven Generations* arms students with the knowledge to adapt and react to those injustices. Because my concern is with the way in which the provincial texts fail to provide non-Native students an understanding of Native perspectives of history, this thesis is aligned with Freire's concern with how education perpetuates the status quo and how it can be transformed. However, Freire's Marxist argument that the oppressed must become cognisant of their own oppression and revolt is not adopted here. Instead, I would maintain that Native students are well aware of conditions of inequality, i.e. that the perspectives of their

families and communities are not written into the historical account, and that the problem of awareness lies with those individuals and institutions in a position to make history curriculum and discourses more inclusive of Native perspectives.

Mainstream curriculum privileges western cultural values, whether intentionally or inadvertently. Although the historical narrative includes descriptions of selected struggles and debates, the structure and presentation of the material does not encourage discussions of resistance and conflict, instead promoting values of compliance and acceptance in students (Anyon, 1980; Aronowitz & Giroux, 1985). While scholars involved in critical education research are in agreement that inequalities exist in society and are perpetuated through schooling in a variety of ways, there is less consensus about how these should be modified and reorganized to contribute to a more inclusive, equitable and emancipatory system of education.

However, there is debate about what role schools should play, if any, in responding to social inequalities and sensitizing students to cultural diversity and the historical context of racial and gender inequality (Schofield, 2001; Webster, 1997: 24). This debate often concerns the extent to which minority cultures and histories should be integrated in the curriculum as a corrective to the problem of inequality and marginalization. The argument against schools as sites of cultural education is often framed in terms of democratic principles of equality and fairness to all groups, where special attention should not be given to some groups and not others. This is problematic, however, in that schools already do express particular cultural affiliations through decisions about holidays, textbooks, teaching methods, recreational activities, etc., creating a dilemma much like that of the division of church and state, which has been viewed as a fallacy in a nation-state which institutionalizes the customs and traditions of Christian cultures above others (Kymlicka, 1995). However, resistance to minority cultural content in schools or other mainstream institutions is often perceived by

proponents of multicultural policies and initiatives as a matter of the dominant group seeking to protect the prominence of its own culture and community, and not wanting to be negatively portrayed through accounts of historical relations of inequality or dominance (Apple, 2002: 4-7).

Because varying degrees of resistance and receptivity can be demonstrated by teachers, administrators and parents in various schooling communities, there are several degrees of integration which actually take place in schools, depending on their position in the political spectrum. Below is James A. Banks' theoretical model for understanding the levels and types of approaches to multicultural curriculum integration (2001: 229-241):

Approaches to Multicultural Curriculum Integration

Level	Type	Description
1	Contributions Approach	Focuses on heroes, holidays, and discrete cultural elements
2	Additive Approach	Content, concepts, themes, and perspectives are added to the curriculum without changing its structure
3	Transformation Approach	Structure of the curriculum is changed to enable students to view concepts, issues, events, and themes from the perspectives of diverse ethnic and cultural groups
4	Social Action Approach	Students make decisions on important social issues and take actions to help solve them

The argument for the inclusion of Native perspectives and representations of history in mainstream textbooks urges governments and schools to promote democratic,

multicultural education which achieves a level of sophistication commensurate with the complexity and diversity of Quebecois and Canadian societies.

History & Multicultural Education in Quebec

Developments in multicultural education in Quebec have included curriculum reforms and the definition of criteria for evaluating pedagogical materials on a range of criteria, including socio-cultural criteria for appropriate content relating to gender, race and ethnicity. The working document *Évaluation des aspects socio-culturels du matériel didactique* identifies five elements of the central criterion that a text should be a "democratic and pluralist representation of society": it should have 1) a just representation of individuals from minority groups, 2) egalitarian relations between individuals of the two sexes, 3) a diversified and non-stereotypical representation of individuals' personal and social characteristics, 4) involvement of individuals from minority groups in contemporary situations, and 5) the non-sexist writing of texts (Gouvernement du Québec, 2001).

In 1997, a range of curricular reforms were outlined for Quebec schools in a provincial government report entitled *Reaffirming the Mission of Our Schools: Report of the Task Force on Curriculum Reform* (Gouvernement du Québec, 1997). In Appendix IV of the report, the Task Force states that "interpretations of Québec history may vary, depending on the student's perspective and their own cultural identity" (ibid.: 130). It also suggest that cultural identity is a matter of linguistic identity, affirming that interpretations of historical facts may differ between English- and French-speaking communities, but making no mention of the importance of non-linguistic forms of cultural diversity. Similarly, the Comité d'évaluation des resources didactiques (CERD), which approves learning materials for Quebec's primary and secondary schools, ensures representation

of the two official linguistic communities in their membership, but has no provision for representing cultural communities defined in non-linguistic terms, including Native peoples and other bicultural groups. Although the inclusion of the Anglophone minority population in the MEQ's curriculum development strategy is a positive move toward the recognition of minority rights, the importance of other types of cultural identity should not be overlooked. In history education and curriculum planning, the inclusion of Native peoples' perspectives is of critical importance in recognition of their status as first inhabitants of the lands now identified as Quebec and Canada.

It is important to note that the Task Force also acknowledges the need for "greater emphasis in the history program on ... the *role* of native peoples in the history of Quebec," along with the contributions of Quebec's English-speaking and immigrant populations (ibid.: 130, emphasis added). It is not clear why a distinction is made between "roles" and "contributions," though the latter suggests a more positive representation of the groups in question. Although the analysis that follows did not focus on representations of all immigrant groups, it does point to significant differences in representations of French, English and Native peoples in provincial textbooks.

While textbooks may no longer contain references to savagery and scalping, there remains a strong tendency for the history of North America to be taught as a story about European economic and political expansion, without adequate representation of the deception and dominance involved in the colonization process, or acknowledgement of the fact that history is written by the conquerors. This and other research suggests that textbook bias persists in spite of semantic improvements to eliminate the types of evaluative assertions and derogatory language identified by Garnet McDiarmid and David Pratt (Francis, 1992; O'Connor, 2001). Indeed, textbook development in Atlantic Canada made the news recently when Native chiefs and community organizations spoke

out against what they claimed to be erroneous information and evasion of critical issues in a social studies text to be used to teach Grade 7 students (Lewandowski, 2004).

This is an unfortunate confirmation of the persistence of the problems identified by McDiarmid and Pratt over thirty years ago. The ongoing challenge to present history in a manner that reflects Native peoples' perspectives forms the basis and the impetus for this thesis and the need to identify concrete strategies for rectification has informed the formulation of the research questions. Identifying which historical and social issues are of greatest concern to the Mohawk community in educating their own youth provides a useful point of departure for analyzing where changes are needed in the mainstream pedagogical materials to include Native self-representations. The next chapter outlines the theoretical and methodological context of the research in more detail before proceeding to the textual analysis.

CHAPTER 3: Theoretical Framework & Methodology

Postmodern Theory & The Science of History

In his chapter entitled "Indians of Childhood," historian Daniel Francis (1992) discusses the evolution of representations of Native peoples in history textbooks from the early-nineteenth to twentieth centuries, pointing to a variety of social and political factors influencing historical interpretation and attitudes toward Native peoples. He argues that textbook representations ranged from being deeply and exclusively negative to identifying Native peoples as allies in the Euro-centered struggle for dominance and nation building, depending on the era and the relationship between the British and various Native peoples at the time. He also points out that "the textbook Indian emerges as even more cruel and depraved in French than in English," referring to the tendency for francophone history writers in Quebec to have been Catholic nationalists who viewed Native resistance as "an affront to the French-Canadian nation and one true faith" (1992: 164)[13]. Francis' observations about textbook representations are one example of a growing body of empirical and theoretical work concerned with the contingent nature of historical interpretation and representation and the socio-political relations that condition the production of knowledge (for other examples see Evans, 1997; Washburn and Trigger, 1996).

The prominence of post-modern theory and critiques of knowledge production in the social sciences has raised important challenges for sociology and history as academic disciplines. Richard Evans describes the influence of postmodern theory on historians as a tendency toward "abandoning the search for truth, the belief in objectivity, and the quest for a scientific approach to the past" (1997: 4). Many postmodern

[13] For further discussion of the history of French Canadian nationalist historiography, see Trigger (1985: 29)

critiques suggest that histories are "fictions" because of the manner in which they are constructed and mediated by their authors (ibid.: 7).

The major critique of methods used to produce and transmit knowledge in the fields of history, sociology and education have followed from the linguistic turn of the 1970's and the development of postmodernist theory in the 1980's, which have turned attention to the problems and politics of representation (Brown, 1998; Hall, 1997). The argument against the possibility of knowing the past through scientific historical methods is grounded in the premise that there is no inherent meaning or substance that can be known outside of the constraints of culture and society, which constitute the lens through which individual historians and generations of people interpret the world. The language of texts and voices is only meaningful within culturally and historically specific contexts of language, communication and interpretation. Postmodernist theorists challenge the possibility of a "true" significance or meaning that is accessible to the social scientist because of the relativism of language and signification, and because of the inevitability that historical knowledge reflects subjective processes of sorting, selecting and interpreting historical "facts". Through this critical analysis of the process of knowledge construction within sociology and history, the notions of factuality and truth have come to be rejected by postmodern and poststructuralist theorists because of their focus on the inherent instability of knowledge across time and space, i.e. in different historical periods, genders, geographies, cultural groups, etc.

The works of R.G. Collingwood (1946) and E. H. Carr (1961) suggest that historians have long recognized the importance of the historian's social, political and historical context. These scholars were among the first to draw attention to the importance of the historian's own era in shaping his or her view of historical phenomena, and the interpretive nature of historical analysis. Today, contemporary scholars have pointed out that postmodern theorists' attention to the author's impact on the framing

and interpretation of historical data is not a new revelation, and is not cause for rejecting the discipline as a science (Evans, 1997; Thompson, 2000). Evans argues against the novelty of postmodern critiques of the discipline, maintaining that historians have "always" known that they could only acquire partial knowledge of the past (1997: 104) and that the importance of context to historical interpretation has been known since Carr's work in 1961 (ibid.: 2). Without dismissing postmodern critiques as unimportant or flawed, Evans points to the fact that the discipline has long been engaged with the debates and challenges currently dominating postmodern discourse, and suggests that concrete examples of critiques invariably end up not being new at all (ibid.: 126).

Like Carr and Evans, Willie Thompson (2000) also espouses moderate views with respect to post-modern critiques in that he recognizes the inherently limited nature of scientific knowledge but does not propose abandoning the effort. As a self-titled neo-realist, he maintains that "verifiable knowledge is possible, though mostly provisional and always incomplete" (2000: x). However, some scholars are more sceptical of postmodern and post-structural theorists' tendency to reduce political life and struggle to a question of textuality. Richard Evans argues that texts are open to multiple readings and interpretations, which may or may not reflect the intended meanings of their authors (1997: 103-04). Yet, he also provides the important reminder that in spite of our new understandings of discourse and semiotics since the linguistic turn in the social sciences, it is important that analytical abstraction not overturn the ability of historians to name and analyze historical injustices, such as Nazi Germany which involved a form of violence against a group which is not subject to an unlimited range of interpretations (ibid.: 124). Ultimately, Evans maintains the position that historians must continue the work of historical interpretation, and the epistemological dilemmas of historiography should be left to philosophers (ibid.: 10). However, this position is not helpful to educators and

evaluators of pedagogical materials who face difficult questions about whose stories should be told and how they should be presented.

It is not my intention to advocate a position of radical relativism in which all claims are taken to be equally legitimate. Instead, knowledge and truth depend on intersubjectivity, or agreement between observers that something can be said to be true (Babbie & Benaquisto, 2002: 40; Berger & Luckman, 1966; Neuendorf, 2002: 11; Neuman, 2003: 74). The point is not whether something is true or not, but whether those charged with determining truthfulness are in agreement one way or another. It is argued here that postmodern approaches to relativism should not preclude the possibility of making clear assertions about "righting the wrongs" of historical accounts that have minimized, or glorified the impacts of colonialism on Native societies.

Beginning from the rationale that the mainstream textbooks have contributed to the injustices of colonization through the omission and negative representation of Native peoples and their historical roles, it is argued that although there can be no objective "truth" against which to measure *Diverse Pasts'* content as representative, the Mohawk self-representations conveyed in *Seven Generations* provide one source for representations and information that would be considered fair and accurate by many Mohawk people. Inclusion of these and other Native peoples' historical perspectives would rectify the injustices of omission from and representation in textbook content. Furthermore, mechanisms to include the input of Native authors and thinkers in the development of textbook content would rectify exclusion from processes of knowledge production. Inclusion of Native perspectives is recommended not because they are more correct or accurate, but because they constitute the unique cultural perspectives of the peoples who have the longest history on this continent and should, therefore, no longer be excluded from the narration of its development to the present day.

However, it is important to acknowledge that mainstream or dominant knowledge is always being called into question by some groups, but that their objections or alternate understandings tend to be silenced, stigmatized or ignored when they originate in a different worldview. The standards of assessment and validation of information that may be agreed upon within a scientific research community do not always correspond to other communities' understandings. In the case of Native peoples' political and social struggles, the extent to which academics, politicians, legal authorities and scientific "experts" support or reject their arguments and claims has very serious implications for the economic, social and cultural renewal and development of communities.

An important theme in poststructuralist and postmodern discourse theory construction of Self and Other through discourse. For example, Michel Foucault's work has been extremely influential among both supporters and critics across the social sciences and humanities. He argues that all knowledge of ourselves, our own identities and desires, and those of other groups, are contingent on discourses produced and perpetuated through processes of objectification (the constitution of social actors and processes as objects of knowledge, primarily through the sciences), dividing practices (the creation of binary categories and systems of classification for objects of knowledge), and subjectification (the process by which agency is mediated by discourses that constitute the identities, belief systems, desires, etc. of individuals). Each of these is a feature of the operation of power relations in society (Foucault, 1983).

Similarly, Linda Smith (1999) argues that the production of knowledge about Indigenous peoples sustains colonial and imperialistic relations through the intersection of research, regulation and representation:

> Research is one of the ways in which the underlying code of imperialism and colonialism is both regulated and realized. It is regulated through the formal rules of individual scholarly disciplines and scientific paradigms, and the institutions that support them (including the state). It is realized in the myriad

> of representations and ideological constructions of the Other in scholarly and 'popular' works, and in the principles which help to select and recontextualize those constructions in such things as the media, official histories and school curricula (1999: 7-8)

In keeping with the approaches of these scholars, I would argue that textbook representations shape students' understanding of Indigenous, European and immigrant populations as individual and social subjects, including the nature of their national citizenship, i.e. their place within Québecois and Canadian society. The production of these distinct types of subjects occurs through the consumption of textbook representations, which are an early example of how social actors come to know Mohawk and Native peoples as objects of knowledge. The production of subject positions also occurs through dividing practices, which classify individuals and groups into dichotomized, and often hierarchical, categories.

As studies in the past 30 years have shown, social scientists and textbooks have tended to depict Indigenous societies and cultures as the Other in relation to European civilizations. This was most striking in Sylvie Vincent and Bernard Arcand's analysis, as indicated by the subtitle of their book: *Comment les Québécois ne sont pas des sauvages*. Other examples of dividing practices in the social sciences include the now contentious Darwinist conceptions in anthropology, which have led to the classification of societies and cultures within hierarchical polarities such as primitive and civilized, simple and complex.

Bruce Trigger discusses the influence of Darwinism in the works of nineteenth century anthropologists in Europe and America, demonstrating how scientific racism and theories of racial superiority began to emerge in Quebecois historiography of Native peoples at the end of the nineteenth century (1985: 16, 34). While critiques and charges of social Darwinism have made the theoretical approach unpopular in contemporary scholarship, many would argue that discursive practices in the academy continue to

divide and classify societies on the basis of economic and technological development, most often with "the West" as the marker against which development and social progress are measured (Hall, 1996b; Sardar, 1999; Sayyid, 2000).

Indigenous Critiques of Historiography

While it is an important advancement that western social scientists recognize the subjective nature of their judgements, evaluations and assessments of Native peoples' histories and historical data, there is another school of thinkers whose voices are echoed in postmodernists' call for the abandonment of 'truth,' 'objectivity,' and scientific method as the standards for defensible social theory and research. These are the voices of Indigenous people who, along with other bicultural groups, have seen themselves misrepresented and exploited in the words and actions of social scientists.

One implication of the inclusion of Mohawk and other Native peoples' views on the history of this continent is the need to radically revise the concept of "prehistory". By identifying "history" as a field of inquiry that begins with the existence of written records, historians and educators have implicitly or explicitly denied the validity of Native peoples' methods of preserving and transmitting knowledge of the past. And while oral histories have gained greater legitimacy in the social sciences and the courts as sources of historical evidence and information (Cruikshank, 1992, 1994; Rush, 2003; von Gernet), there remain significant cultural divides between western academic and Indigenous approaches to the past. These gaps need to be bridged if Native perspectives are to be meaningfully included in high school history textbooks and the academic research that informs them.

Bruce Trigger discusses the awkward relationship between the disciplines of history and anthropology, explaining that the latter was "created in the nineteenth century as a separate discipline charged with studying peoples who lacked their own

history" (1985: 5). This reflects an outmoded belief that Indigenous systems of knowledge can be evaluated using the ontological approaches developed in the western cultures of Europe and North America. However, there is a growing body of literature produced by Native scholars which aims to elucidate the differences between Native and non-Native approaches to history and to knowledge more generally. First, a brief discussion of western historiography is provided.

The western concept of historiography refers to historical research, interpretation, and writing, including their theoretical frameworks and methodological processes. The study of Native histories requires the expansion of historiography to include oral methods and traditions. This could be called oral historiography and would be understood to refer to the oral transmission of historical knowledge, and the study of the techniques used for transmitting, accessing, and interpreting historical knowledge within oral historical traditions. This need not be exclusive of western historical practices, such as the use of human subjects for obtaining historical information, but would include Native cultures which continue to employ non-written methods of record-keeping.

While there is extensive recognition in the fields of literature and anthropology that Native American historical knowledge is preserved and transferred through oral traditions, there is still a tendency to relegate Native knowledge to the realm of folklore or myth, especially when it contradicts non-Native theories about the history and development of North American societies and natural environments (Deloria, 1997). All too often, the ideas contained within Native knowledge only become recognized as legitimate claims once they have been published in a written form – usually by non-Native "experts" – in accordance with the semantic, structural, and institutional conventions of western science and academia.

Vine Deloria Jr. (1997) draws attention to the existence of non-western systems of knowledge among tribal peoples worldwide, arguing that Native American knowledge is routinely dismissed as folk wisdom and lore by western scientists, at least until they arrive at the same findings and conclusions, at which point it becomes "fact" or "truth" since it has been confirmed by a non-Native person of stature. Deloria describes the idealized but undervalued oral traditions of Native peoples as including:

> ... the teachings that have been passed down from one generation to the next over uncounted centuries. The oral tradition is a loosely held collection of anecdotal material that, taken together, explains the nature of the physical world *as people have experienced it* and the important events of their historical journey (1997: 36, emphasis added)

The qualification that this knowledge is experientially derived is a very important feature of the tribal or Native approach to knowledge in general and oral tradition in particular. It points to the importance placed on first-hand experience and observation as a source of validation for knowledge, and it points to the importance given to allowing different individuals and groups a different experience of what westerners might call the "same phenomenon," highlighting another difference between science and the oral tradition: science aims to arrive at a master narrative, or an overarching theory which accounts for all known information about a given event or phenomenon which is arguably true for all people at all times (e.g. the view that humans crossed from Asia on the Bering land bridge, and that anyone from any culture who looks at the facts will concur that this is the most reasonable explanation available). Native traditions of knowledge, on the other hand, do not seek to make grand claims, but only explanations that satisfy the groups that support them. As Deloria explains it,

> Tribal elders did not worry if their vision of creation was entirely different from the scenario held by a neighboring tribe. People believed that each tribe had its own special relationship with the superior spiritual forces that governed the universe. The task of each tribe was to remain true to its own special calling without worrying about what others were doing. Tribal knowledge was not fragmented data arranged according to rational speculation. It was simply

> the distilled memory of the people describing the events they had experienced and the lands they had lived in. (1997: 36)

The absence of an approach that rationalizes fragmented data is also evident in what Deloria (1994) describes as a tribal approach to time and chronology. He maintains that for Native peoples the concepts of *before* and *after*, or chronological sequences, are of little importance - what is important is what happened and its impact on the people, not the precise timeframe of the events (1994: 98-103). Histories of migrations, for example, are presented in terms of the reasons for the relocation, and not when they took place; according to Deloria, "exactly when they moved was, again, 'a long time ago'" (1994: 102). As will be seen in Chapter 4, *Seven Generations* includes migration stories which fit this characterization in that specific timeframes are not treated as central features of the historical account; instead the emphasis is on the reasons and outcomes of the Iroquois migrations.

Whereas Deloria focuses a great deal of analytical attention on the comparative discussion of western and tribal approaches to religion, geography and history, Linda Tuhiwai Smith (1999), a Maori woman from New Zealand, turns her attention to the significance of history, research and writing, and concepts of time and space as processes of colonization. Smith uses these issues as points of departure for devising new approaches to research, writing and social change with Indigenous communities. In her seminal work *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples,* Smith maintains that Indigenous peoples have been colonized through the exercise of power over lands (namely the renaming and modification of landscapes), over minds (through representations in scientific and popular discourses and education), and over histories (through the re-writing and negation of Indigenous experiences and worldviews). The current analysis of textbook representations illuminates each of these three forms of colonization by showing how the writing and framing of Mohawk and mainstream

historical discourses foster different understandings of the issues of territorial claims, Native rights, and the role of western sciences in shaping popular opinion on the issues.

In a section entitled "Is History Important For Indigenous Peoples?", Smith points out that the insights of post-modern scholars who argue for the importance of particularism and relativism instead of Eurocentrism, essentialism and universalism have long been recognized among Indigenous people. She draws on the works and words of Indigenous people and non-Indigenous scholars to argue that western history is characterized by the following set of guiding principles and assumptions (1999: 30-1):

- that history is a totalizing discourse (that it regroups "all known knowledge into a coherent whole"),
- that there is a universal history, (the focus of history is on development of basic values and characteristics shared by all humans and societies)
- that history is one large chronology, (chronology makes events "real" by locating them temporally, and allows tracking of progress and development)
- that history is about development, (the focus of history is on the progress of societies through stages of increased complexity, rationality and bureaucratization)
- that history is about a self-actualizing human subject, (humans achieve their potential by gaining increased control of their faculties, moving from the fulfillment of basic needs to development of emotions to the development of the intellect, and finally of morality)
- that the story of history can be told in one coherent narrative, (that giving order to factoids will produce a picture of the truth)
- that history as a discipline is innocent, (that it is pure, unrelated to other disciplines, and fact-oriented rather than interpretive)
- that history is constructed around binary categories, (particularly the binaries of *before* and *after*, related to chronology)
- that history is patriarchal (focused on the development and progress of men – assumed to be more capable of developing than women – especially through focus on bureaucratic and socio-political history)

The features of western historiography identified above have been taken into account during the comparative analysis of the two textbooks. While they do not constitute the

key elements of the analysis and discussion, some observations are addressed in the analysis and conclusion.

Smith does not use a comparative approach by highlighting key characteristics of Indigenous approaches to history, as does Deloria. While such a comparative approach might simplify the task of the social scientist, it would also be difficult and contentious to identify pan-Indigenous features of approaches to history. Instead, Smith focuses on the development of community-based models for research that are appropriate to the cultural and epistemological perspectives common to many Indigenous peoples.

Research with Indigenous Peoples

The approach used to carry out the research for this thesis draws heavily from developments in action and community-based research methods, and employs a theoretical and conceptual approach that aims to reflect the interests and concerns of Native people. This approach is a response to the long history of Native people being over-researched without benefiting from that research. This scenario is related to a tradition of academic and other types of research designed to extract information and data from Indigenous communities without adequate respect for the cultural protocols and values of the communities they study (Ball, forthcoming; Mihesuah, 1998; Smith, 1999). It also reflects the view held by many academics that the pursuit of knowledge is adequate as an end in itself, which is not consistent with Native peoples' concern with using knowledge and research to advance community development and social justice issues.

The major objections of Indigenous people to this type of research experience are that: 1) researchers have extracted the information they needed or the knowledge that they deemed valuable without acknowledging or adequately compensating their informants; 2) information has been gained on false premises, friendships were forged

and then abandoned after the research was finished; 3) research methods were not sensitive to the cultural values of the groups being "studied"; 4) the relationships between researchers and informants were characterized by power imbalances resulting in damages to the dignity, privacy, or psychological well-being of individuals and communities; 5) intellectual properties have been exploited, misrepresented and/or appropriated; and, 6) researchers have benefited from monetary and professional gains without ensuring benefits for local people or organizations (Ball, forthcoming; Biolsi and Zimmerman, 1997; Mitchell and Baker, 2005). In Canada this has led to a number of initiatives to establish and enforce research protocols for the protection and benefit of communities who choose to participate in academic and scientific research (Brant Castellano, 2004; Piquemal, 2000; Schnarch, 2004). This is part of a growing rigour in efforts to ensure that research methods incorporate and respect Indigenous cultural values and systems of knowledge.

Linda Smith (1999) argues that social science research continues to colonize Indigenous peoples by invalidating their ways of knowing, by making "specimens" of peoples and cultures, and by advancing the interests of western researchers without compensation or benefits to communities. Linda Smith raises concerns about the *right to knowledge*, suggesting that western (and Indigenous) researchers have a responsibility to demonstrate their merit in accessing the knowledge they seek, and that they often do not succeed in recognizing the knowledge that is most important to understanding Indigenous perspectives of the issue under study (1999: 173-74).

This history of exploitation has been experienced by other groups disadvantaged by the power dynamics of race, class and gender in western society. Movements for resistance and social change have underpinned the development of new methodologies in the social sciences, namely action research, feminist research methods, and community-based approaches, which seek to make research involving bicultural groups

serve their interests and advance their struggles for change (Kirby and McKenna, 1989; Mitchell and Baker, 2005; Reitsma-Street and Brown, 2002). In research with Native peoples, research ethics generally include communities having a role in identifying and approving the types of investigations that will be done and the results that will be made public. This approach is reflected in OCAP, a set of research principles developed by the National Aboriginal Health Organization as a result of consultations with First Nations, Inuit and Métis peoples in Canada (Ball, forthcoming: 18; Schnarch, 2004). OCAP affirms that Indigenous people in Canada must have ownership, control, access, and protection where research is concerned. There is also reason to believe that the principles of OCAP would have a great deal of potential and utility in policy development activities (Sinclair, 2004).

In this thesis, every effort has been made to avoid replicating the pattern of exploitation that social scientists inherit as part of the legacy of their profession. In the early stages of developing my research topic I consulted people working in the field of Native education at McGill and Concordia universities in Montreal, soliciting their input on the most critical areas for research related to the political aspects of education about Native issues. Prior to carrying out any key informant interviews, the interview guide was tested informally with Native friends to ensure as much as possible that participants would be comfortable with the questions and that they would support the importance of the research topic. Finally, participants have been given an opportunity to review and comment on the results and reporting of the research.

While efforts were made to work with Native people in the development of the research question and approach, I was ultimately left to determine on my own what type of research would be most important and effective for advancing non-Native peoples understandings of issues related to Native histories, education and politics. The topic of history education and textbook representations was ultimately selected based on the

frequency with which Native people continue to make reference to problems stemming the ways in which Native peoples are represented or excluded in the content.[14]

Contact was made with the committee responsible for textbook approval the Quebec Ministry of Education. An interview was conducted with the Coordinator of the Bureau d'approbation des matériaux didactiques (BAMD), who also heads the Comité d'évaluation des resources didactiques (CERD), the committee responsible for approving the textbooks used to teach Grade 10 history in Quebec. An effort was made to interview several members of the CERD, but I was unable to gain access to their contact information to invite them individually, and no responses were received when a general invitation was sent via the Coordinator. However, the Coordinator agreed to meet with me as a representative for the group. He expressed a willingness to participate in the research by giving me an interview, and agreed to consider the results and implications upon completion of the research.

Methodological Rationale

As discussed in the previous chapters, what is understood to have occurred in the past and how events are represented in textbooks reflect the cultural, social, political and economic positioning of society's dominant institutions and the individuals working within them. The notion of a 'true' account of historical events is no longer held up as an ideal because of a growing acknowledgement in the social sciences and humanities that multiple truths exist by virtue of the multiple positions from which phenomena are perceived and experienced. And according to Vine Deloria Jr. and others, this acceptance of the unique and diverse perspectives of phenomena has long been present in the philosophies of Native peoples in North America. This does not imply a

[14] I refer here to statements made over the past ten years in a variety of public settings, including cultural events such as powwows, academic lectures and seminars, and social justice rallies.

form of radical relativism in which anything can be said to be true, but suggests that different groups recognize different truths to be significant

Proceeding from the assumption that multiple histories exist and are taught to young people to instil in them an appreciation of their political and cultural heritage, the design for this research aims to describe and interpret Mohawk historical discourses as they are represented in the social studies text *Seven Generations*. For the purpose of analysis, the English language text approved for HIST 414 was also analyzed to compare Mohawk and "mainstream" representations of key events, concepts, and issues.

By examining the content of the English-language textbook used in Quebec high schools, the current analysis contributes a preliminary and partial indication of the extent to which Mohawk self-representations differ from the mainstream representations to which students are currently exposed. It should be made clear that this is not a study of how well or poorly represented Mohawks or other Indigenous peoples are in the provincial textbooks. Instead, the provincial textbook analysis is used as a point of contrast which serves to highlight those characteristics that are most distinctive about Mohawk self-representations, which ultimately signals the areas where the most effort is needed to bridge the divide between Mohawk and non-Mohawk understandings of the history of this continent, and the implications for contemporary social relations and development.

This analysis is also influenced by key informant interviews with Mohawk people specialized in the fields of history and education, with the original intention of comparing interview results with the content of the four textbooks approved for use in Quebec's HIST 414 course. However, an insufficient number of interview respondents combined with the large amount of material involved in analyzing four textbooks led to the development of the alternate research design outlined here. Although saturation could

not be achieved due to lack of sufficient interview participants, those interviews that were conducted have offered a great deal of rich information about the types of discourses that are used to describe the history of the province and the country from the perspective of Mohawk people. Therefore, no conclusive statements can be made about widespread patterns or themes among respondents. However, they were useful and formative for the development of the textual analysis.

Critical Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method

An important contributor to discourse analysis in the sociology of education is Basil Bernstein, who pointed out that to examine the relationship between pedagogic discourses and asymmetrical power relations, researchers should focus on the pedagogic discourses themselves, pointing to the tendency of researchers to overlook the characteristics of those discourses in favour of interpreting their productive powers in society (Bernstein, 1990: 166). Bernstein's theoretical and empirical approach was central to the emergence of the sociology of knowledge as a sub-field (Moore and Maton, 2001: 157). While retaining Bernstein's focus on the content of pedagogical discourses in the field of history education, the methodology used for carrying out this discourse analysis is most influenced by Norman Fairclough's version of critical discourse analysis.

Fairclough's explanation of social structures, social events and social practices is illustrative of the theoretical model guiding this research:

> Social structures define what is possible, social events constitute what is actual, and the relationship between potential and actual is mediated by social practices. Language (more broadly, semiosis) is an element of the social at each of these levels – languages are a type of social structure, texts are elements of social events, and orders of discourse are elements of (networks of) social practices. One consequence is that rather than starting from texts, one starts from social events (and chains and networks of events), and analyses texts as elements of social events (Fairclough, 2003: 223)

Thus, the texts analyzed here are viewed as elements of social events in that they are an actual, concrete manifestation of social relations. An order of discourse is a social structuring of semiotic differences – a particular social ordering of relationships amongst different ways of making meaning, i.e. different discourses and genres and styles. One aspect of this ordering is dominance: some ways of making meaning are dominant or mainstream in a particular order of discourse, others are marginal, or oppositional, or 'alternative' (Fairclough, 2003: 206). Orders of discourse often involve hegemonic political relations, in which mainstream discourses serve to legitimate relations of dominance (ibid.: 207). Theoretically, my approach is aligned with Fairclough in that I maintain that discourse is both constituted by, and constitutive of, the social contexts in which it circulates. This is distinct from the view that discourse produces, constitutes and encompasses all of social life and practice, as in the approaches of Chantal Mouffe and Ernesto Laclau (Laclau and Mouffe, 1985; Purvis and Hunt, 1993). Instead, discourse functions along with non-discursive forces to infuse social life with significance, direction and purpose, and both discursive and non-discursive forces are instrumental in the reproduction and transformation of social relations.

Fairclough and others, like Smith and Foucault discussed above, have argued that discourse plays a critical role in the constitution or construction of social identities, social relations, and systems of knowledge and meaning (Jorgensen, 2002: 67). I would argue that each of these three effects of discourse are part of the processes that occur in the education of youth: their identities are further formulated as racialized and gendered subjects, they acquire more sophisticated understandings of social relations and their place within them, and they internalize the systems of knowledge and meaning which underlie the content and structure of curriculum and pedagogy.

The aim of the analysis is not to draw inferences about the intentions of authors or the specific effects on readers. Instead the aim is to describe, from an interpretive and

critical perspective, the messages conveyed about Mohawk and Native peoples' histories through the content of texts, rather than to infer or predict, as in other approaches to textual analysis (Neuendorf, 2002: 52-55). The approach is also consistent with the views of Ian Parker who, writing about the work of Roland Barthes in *Mythologies*, writes that "once we start to describe what texts mean we are elaborating meanings that go beyond individual intentions, discourse that are transindividual" (Parker, 2002: 7). The textual analysis that follows is most concerned with the content and structure of the discourses presented to students. It is recognized that a separate study would be required to carry out an analysis of the production of the texts, which is where one would be better suited to look for insight into the intended meanings and social contexts of authors' works.

Analytical Framework

Textual Analysis

For the purpose of focusing the analysis from a broad interest in Mohawk historical discourses to an exploration of specific themes and narratives, it was important to identify topics that seemed to be given particular historical significance. Based on interview responses and a preliminary analysis of *Seven Generations*, the subjects of worldview, sovereignty, nationhood, and territorial claims were identified as the central elements of Mohawk historical discourses, i.e. Mohawk approaches to interpreting history and its significance for contemporary society. Consequently, both *Seven Generations* and *Diverse Pasts* were analyzed with a focus on these themes. The analysis focused on those sections where keywords occurred, taken in context with their position within the sequence of sections and chapters within each text.

In the preliminary interviews conducted with key informants, respondents were asked to identify the topics which they found to be most important for conveying a

Mohawk or Indigenous perspective of the history of Quebec and Canada. After being asked to provide detailed information about the topics they identified as most important, they were asked about a number of topics identified in the 'mainstream' historical accounts with respect to Native peoples in Quebec and Canada. Finally, they were asked to identity the key issues that should be presented, if any, regarding contemporary social issues, again with details about the information that should be provided. Between the identification of key issues and the commentary on content for issues introduced in the interview guide, all Mohawk participants identified the importance of presenting Quebecois students with Native perspectives of Iroquois worldview and values, nationhood and sovereignty, and claims to land.

In the analysis of the *Seven Generations* and *Diverse Pasts* texts, an interpretive, qualitative approach was used. This methodology was considered preferable to a quantitative content analysis due to increased sensitivity to the dynamics and nuances of the texts, by taking into account the presence, abstraction, arrangement and additions (Fairclough, 2003). Fairclough outlines the following questions to the text for each of these dimensions:

- **Presence** > which elements of events or chains of events are present/absent, included/excluded, prominent/background?
- **Abstraction** > What degree of generalization from specific events? Most concrete (specific social events) > More abstract/general (series and sets of social events) > Most abstract (social practices and social structures [rather than events])
- **Arrangement** > How are events ordered?
- **Additions** > what is added to representations of events: explanation, legitimation (cause, rationale, purpose of actions or events), evaluations?

While the analysis does not systematically report on these four dimensions, they were used to guide the analysis and interpretation of the texts. However, only the most

poignant examples and discussions relating specifically to sovereignty, nationhood and territory were included in the findings reported here.

Interview Design

Interviews were conducted with respondents currently or formerly employed in the field of history and social studies education at the high school level. They included people well versed in both the pedagogical and administrative aspects of secondary level curriculum planning for teaching the history of Quebec and Canada, whether from a general or specifically Mohawk perspective. In addition to this central criterion, the Mohawk participants were selected on the basis that they are current or former residents of Kahnawake or Kanehsatake.

The interview guide was designed to investigate what participants thought were the most important issues and knowledge to be passed on to young Quebecers in order to impart Indigenous perspectives of the history of Quebec and Canada. The focus of the interviews was on what should be taught to Quebecois youth to convey a Native or Mohawk perspective of history. To situate this design within the framework of multicultural education theory, the concern was with the ways in which Quebecois students are sensitized to the cultures and experiences of Native nations - as in the "cultural pluralism" and "cultural difference" paradigms of multicultural education theory - rather than on the role of multicultural curriculum in the identity development of students from those nations - as in the "self-concept development" paradigm (Banks, 2001: 93-95). However, this distinction became less relevant with the shift to textual analysis. The interview guide is provided in Appendix A.

Obstacles to Original Design

There were some difficulties encountered in getting Mohawk community members to participate in the original project design. This was due in part to the small number of people involved in the specific activities related to history education, and in part to the situation – commonly encountered in Native communities - that those individuals who have the knowledge and cross-cultural comfort level to act as consultants, advisors and informants for non-Native research and policy activities have little time for new commitments of their time and energy because they are already in high demand. Another group that would have been invaluable to understanding Mohawk historical discourses, but who also proved to be inaccessible to me, are the Elders of Kahnawake and Kanehsatake. As was brought to my attention by a young community member in Kahnawake who assisted me with local resources and contacts, Elders are very shy and it would be difficult to get them to open up to a stranger, let alone a non-Mohawk person from a university research project. Working with Elders would have required a different research design and timeline to accommodate the different ways in which knowledge is imparted within Native cultures, which tend to be less direct than the format of semi-structured interviews.

Although interviews were conducted with non-Mohawk informants involved in the fields of Indigenous peoples histories in Quebec, history education, and history textbook and curriculum development, these interviews were not included in the final analysis because there were insufficient interviews conducted to permit comparison between Mohawk and non-Mohawk representations and discourses about the history of Quebec and Canada, and Indigenous perspectives thereof.

Limits & Implications of the Approach

In identifying the parameters of the approach used, an important point is that the current research could be elaborated with the inclusion of in-class observations, which were not included in the design due to the constraints of time and resources. As a result, this study furthers an understanding of how historical discourses are written about for student audiences, but not necessarily what they are *taught* in the classroom.

Another point for consideration is that the *Seven Generations* textbook was written by a Jesuit residing in Kahnawake at the time, which may raise questions about the 'authenticity' of the views presented. That is, how Mohawk can the discourses within the text be if the author is not Mohawk? On this point, it is considered that even a textbook authored by a Mohawk person would most likely be subject to disagreements about interpretation, style, choice of words, etc. That is, the issue of authenticity is not resolved simply by considering the ethnicity or race of an author. Although *Seven Generations* was authored by a Jesuit, it is considered to be a Mohawk-produced text for the purposes of this research because it was produced under the direction of the Kahnawake Survival School Center for Curriculum Development and its content is strongly guided by Mohawk voices, as the author points out:

> *Seven Generations: A History of the Kanienkehaka* does contain, when possible, the Mohawk point of view of history. The words and thoughts of many Mohawk teachers and traditional leaders have been recorded throughout history. I have included much of this information, in an attempt to provide that Mohawk point of view to the teacher. In a way, this book is their work too, and I have been their editor ... All of the members of the Combined School Committee helped to bring this project through to completion. In a way they are the heart and soul of the project. They made numerous suggestions about illustrations, content, and wording that were incorporated into the text. The staff of the Survival School as well as the students helped with criticism and by providing reference material for the text. (Blanchard, 1980: x)

In addition to the input of Kahnawake community members, the fact that the text continues to be taught for the Survival School social studies curriculum suggests that it

continues to do a reasonable job of reflecting Mohawk perspectives of history, or one rendition of them. A final consideration related to the *Seven Generations* text is that it is not as current as would be ideal, having been published in 1980. According to one interview respondent, an updated text with content on the more recent developments in the history of the community and the region, and one authored by a Mohawk person, has not been produced due to a shortage of resources.

Regarding the analysis of the discursive similarities and differences in *Seven Generations* and *Diverse Pasts*, a few words should be said about the limitations to the two texts' comparability. First, the former was written roughly fifteen years earlier than the latter, which suggests that they may have been written in the context of different conventions and expectations of pedagogical texts. However, the fact that both are currently used in classrooms justifies their comparative analysis, even if they were produced under different conditions. The second consideration is that they are written with differing objectives and audiences. *Seven Generations* is written as a history of the Kanienkehaka or Mohawk people, which spans a broad geographic range including the lands now known as Quebec and Canada, whereas *Diverse Pasts* is written as a history of Quebec and Canada, which involves a diverse range of groups, including the Mohawk nation and the Iroquois Confederacy. This distinction must be kept in mind when drawing conclusions about the differences and similarities in the discourses presented in the two texts.

CHAPTER 4: Representations of Mohawk & Other Native Societies

The previous chapters have provided a framework for understanding the political nature of history textbooks content and their role in perpetuating inequalities and injustices between Native and non-Native people in Canada. The analysis that follows provides empirical evidence of the differences that are being argued between the texts' discursive representations of nationhood, territory and sovereignty. Again, the analysis focuses on the following questions: What discourses are used to teach Mohawk youth about historical events? What are the main characteristics and principles of the historical discourses presented in the Mohawk text? Are those discourses also represented in the English-language history textbook for Quebec high schools? And finally, how might changes be made in the content of the English-language provincial textbook to include Mohawk self-representations of their communities' histories? The focus of the analysis is on areas of difference that suggest opportunities for the inclusion of Mohawk and other Native peoples' historical perspectives.

The textual analysis reveals that discourses on Mohawk nationhood and sovereignty are the most prominent feature of the historical accounts presented in *Seven Generations*. These two concepts and the principles outlined within them underpin virtually all aspects of the history of the Kanienkehaka as it is presented in the Mohawk text. Because Mohawk historical perspectives are taken as a point of departure, and based on the formulation of the research questions above, *Diverse Pasts* has been analyzed with a view to assessing whether Mohawk discourses are present within the texts' content. Therefore, the central concepts of nationhood and sovereignty, and the related discourses on territorial claims, are the focus of the textual analysis of *Diverse Pasts.* The analysis reveals that while far from being central to the historical discourses

about the Iroquois and other Native peoples, these political concepts are central to the struggles between the French and English in Canada.

Discourses on Nationhood & Sovereignty

In Chapter 8 of *Seven Generations*, entitled "The Two Row Wampum Treaty and the Principle of Sovereignty,"[15] the principles of nationhood and sovereignty are laid out explicitly:

> A nation that has sovereignty is independent and free, with the right to a territory of its own. Nations do not fight for sovereignty. They either have it or they do not. Sometimes it happens that a nation has to fight to have other nations recognize and respect this sovereignty ... The word nation comes from the Latin word meaning "birth". A nation is born from a common stock and shares a common heritage. It is important to point out that in many cases Mohawk concepts and English concepts differ greatly. The concept of nation has similar meanings in the Mohawk and English languages. The Mohawk word for nation is Kanakerahsera. Naker is the root of the word to be born. Therefore, the Mohawk concept of nation like the English concept of nation means "to be born from". To belong to a nation means to share the common heritage, beliefs, history and world view of a single people. (p. 122-123)[16]

The understandings of nationhood presented above are used and reiterated consistently throughout the text of *Seven Generations.* The twin concepts of sovereignty and nationhood are invoked to interpret the conflicts and disputes of the Mohawk Nation and the Iroquois Confederacy with the nations of Europe and the governments of Canada and the United States. They are presented in the prose of the textbook as well as in the excerpts of historical documents such as speeches, letters, and petitions from Iroquois political leaders to their European counterparts in North America. As will be seen, *Diverse Pasts* is characterized by inconsistency and ambiguity in its depictions of Mohawk nationhood, sovereignty, and territory.

---

[15] *Seven Generations* states that "According to John Pyrlaeus, the Two Row Wampum Treaty was made in the year 1645 between the Kanienkehaka and the Dutch" at Tawasentha, near Albany (p. 122).

[16] For the sake of brevity, all references to the two texts under analysis are cited only by page number in this chapter.

The specific terms "sovereign" and "sovereignty" occurred in a wide range of contexts within *Seven Generations*, including: the discovery of Columbus, the Two Row wampum, the four Iroquois Wars and the Peace of 1667, treacheries against the Kanienkehaka, the Seven Years War, the American War of Independence, the Patriotes rebellion in Lower Canada, ironwork and entertainment as Mohawk occupations, plans to assimilate Native people, American/Canadian citizenship and traditional government, Native education, military service, the Jay Treaty, the Indian Act, and land claims. The fact that the concept occurs in such a vast range of topics illustrates the manner in which the concept is used consistently to inform virtually every aspect of the Mohawk peoples' existence as a people, and particularly in relation to European forms of government.

In addition to these specific terms, the general principles of sovereignty were also invoked in references to the non-interference, independence, and territories of all nations, Native and European alike. The guiding principles of *Seven Generations*' discourses on sovereignty and nationhood are well summarized in a section explaining that the Two Row Wampum is the most important treaty the Kanienkehaka ever signed,[17] even if it is not upheld, and that the 5 points below are central to understanding the history of the Kanienkehaka:

1. The Kanienkehaka are a nation. That nation is sovereign, independent and owns a certain amount of land.
2. The nations of Europe and the new nations of North America (Canada, United States and Mexico) are also sovereign nations. The Kanienkehaka must not interfere with the internal workings of those nations, and those nations must not interfere with the Kanienkehaka.
3. The Kanienkehaka have always recognized the sovereignty and independence of the European nations.
4. The nations of Europe have claimed to recognize the sovereignty of the Kanienkehaka, but their actions show that they do not. Therefore, much of what is written about Mohawk history by Europeans, is biased by the distorted point of view of European writers.

[17] This indicates that the wampum is the equivalent of European writing; signing an agreement takes many forms besides a hand-written signature.

5. Any history of the Kanienkehaka that is accurate, must deal with the sovereignty of the Mohawk Nation.

The implication of the fifth statement is that *Diverse Pasts* cannot be considered an "accurate" historical account from the Mohawk perspective because it does not address the sovereignty of the Mohawk nation, with the exception of two references to "Native demands for self-government" which are not explained, except indirectly through a discussion of the Mohawk land claims in Kahnesatake which were at issue during the Oka Crisis (p. 387, 398, 399). This point is discussed at more length below.

Diverse Pasts presents an ambiguous representation of Native peoples as distinct and sovereign nations. There is relatively frequent use of the term "nations" to refer to Native peoples, but it is used interchangeably with "people/peoples", "tribes", "groups" and "bands". For example, in one paragraph the Iroquois peoples are referred to as both tribes and nations: "The Huron and other Iroquoian tribes in southern Ontario numbered some 45 000. South of Lake Ontario the five nations of the Iroquois League numbered about 20 000" (p. 13). While at first glance it could seem that "nations" refers to peoples who form a confederacy, as do the Iroquois, but the term is also used to describe the various Algonquian peoples: "The main nations in eastern Canada were the Beothuk, Micmac, Abenaki, Montagnais, Attikamek, Cree, Algonquin, and Maliseet-Passamaquoddy" (p. 12-13). Thus, there appears to be no logic to the variation between nations, peoples, tribes, and bands, suggesting that all terms are equal as identifiers for Native social or cultural communities. In this way, they do not reflect a politicized conception of sovereignty or nationhood such as that suggested in *Seven Generations*. Diverse Pasts also identifies the Mohawk people as a "distinct minority" in the following passage:

> For their part, the Native peoples remained distinct minorities, subject to many of the same work experiences as whites. The Mohawk – established at Kahnawake since the 1670s – combined subsistence farming with work in the

> fur and timber trades. Esteemed across Canada as canoe handlers, transport workers, and packers in the fur trade, the Kahnawake Mohawk were later prized as highly skilled river drivers and timber rafters (p. 129)

This representation of Native peoples as distinct minorities is confusing in that it recognizes their distinctiveness while pointing to their shared experience with other (white) Canadians. It is not clear what a distinct minority is in social, cultural or political terms, but the use of the term "white" is striking in that it presents a racialized minority status rather than one based on national or cultural identity. A non-racial approach might have posited the contrast between Native peoples and, for example, Canadians of European descent or Euro-Canadians. *Seven Generations* also makes occasional reference to "white settlers" or "the white man," which is problematic because it is a racially charged characterization, and one which is arguably less relevant to contemporary multicultural societies where members of many ethnic groups are part of the non-Native mainstream of Canadian society.

It is important to note that the passage above is one of the only instances in *Diverse Pasts* which presents a positive representation of Mohawk contributions to Canadian society. However, this representation is consistent with representations in *Seven Generations* which include extensive discussion of the Mohawk iron workers' contributions, as well as highlighting the place of river pilots in Kanienkehaka history (p. 322-24). However, the far more recurrent representation of the Mohawk in *Diverse Pasts* is that of the Iroquois posing an ongoing threat of violence to European settlers, discussed at greater length below.

Returning to the analysis of discourses on nationhood and sovereignty, in the absence of a clear language to describe Native peoples' status as nations prior to European arrival, *Diverse Pasts* does present a consistent discourse on Native peoples' prior occupancy and claims to lands and territories in North America, particularly in the beginning of the text:

> North America was occupied for thousands of years by the Native peoples before Europeans arrived. (p. 2)
>
> For thousands of years before Europeans came to America, Native peoples inhabited the land. (p. 4)
>
> The Algonquians and Iroquoians were divided into nations that lived in distinct territories, as you can see from figure 1.8 (Figure 1.8 – *Native peoples at the time of European contact: language groups and nations*) (p. 11-12)
>
> The Iroquoians occupied the area from Chesapeake Bay in the south to Georgian Bay in the north and from Québec City in the east to Detroit in the west. (p. 13)
>
> When the Europeans first arrived, over a million Native people lived north of Mexico, and about 20 000 lived in what is today Québec. (p. 14)
>
> The Native peoples of Canada have lived here for thousands of years. (p. 15)
>
> People used to say that Columbus "discovered" America. This does not do justice to the Native peoples, who lived on the continent for thousands of years before 1492. (p. 32)

While the references to Native peoples' long histories in North America are consistent with Native peoples' self-representations and understanding of contemporary Native claims, it is important to point out that the discourse of Native peoples having *occupied*, *inhabited*, and *lived* in North America does not establish the same link of the people to the land that is conveyed in the Mohawk historical discourse. The discourses in *Seven Generations* convey the inseparable relationship between nationhood and territory as part of sovereignty, beginning with the migrations of the Iroquois and the emergence of the Kanienkehaka as a distinct nation with a distinct territory called Kanienkeh. Within *Seven Generations*, the Kanienkehaka are represented as the people of Kanienkeh, and their national identity is inextricably linked to their place within that specific territory. While *Diverse Pasts* makes Native peoples' occupation of lands explicit, it does not convey a politicized understanding of that occupation akin to that espoused in the Mohawk discourse of the *Seven Generations* text.

An important part of the Mohawk discourse on sovereignty is the need for nations to "remind" other nations of their sovereignty. In most cases, discussions focus on the Kanienkehaka reminding Europeans of the principle of sovereignty and historic agreements. In one case, citing speeches in which Iroquois leaders (Seneca in both cases) reminded Euro-Americans of Iroquois sovereignty by diplomatically refusing European education and religion, the Iroquois affirmed their unique connection to the Creator as the source of the land, religion, and beliefs that they hold. As Red Jacket states, "We understand that your religion is written in a book. If it was intended for us as well as you, why has not the Great Spirit given it to us, and not only to us, but why did he not give to our forefathers, the knowledge of that book, with the means of understanding it rightly?" (p. 129). This demonstrates a distinctly Mohawk or Native view of nationhood as a gift from the Creator, characterized by a unique language, culture, knowledge, and responsibilities.

In some instances the discourse on Mohawk sovereignty focuses on the relationship between nations, e.g. the right of the Kanienkehaka to choose who they will trade with and to accept or reject prices offered for furs. The principles of sovereignty are reiterated throughout the *Seven Generations* text. The sub-section entitled *Champlain Fought Against the Kanienkehaka* emphasizes that, from the Kanienkehaka perspective, "Champlain had violated the basic principles of sovereignty" by siding with the Montagnais during the Second Algonquin War (p.117). This is because he had violated the principle of non-interference in the affairs of other nations by becoming involved in the conflict. In another example, it states that "The seventeenth century Kanienkehaka were wise men and women. They knew from their past experience with both the French and the Dutch that they could not coexist with the Dutch unless both agreed to the principles of mutual non-interference" (p. 125). The 'past experience'

referred to is described to have occurred during the Second Algonquin War, the events of which are presented roughly as follows.

As a result of the First Algonquin War, the Kanienkehaka are said to have controlled the waterways and trade and had control of the affairs of the region. The French were allied with the Algonquin in challenging the authority of the Kanienkehaka. The French also introduced extermination warfare using firearms which differed from Native warfare, which typically allowed retreating forces to back down, the goal being to deter the enemy rather than to kill as many people as possible (p. 118). New approaches to warfare and weaponry are cited as the first contribution of Europeans to life in North America. The Dutch are said to have almost made the "same mistake as the French in their dealings with the Kanienkehaka" when some of their men aligned with the Mahicans in an attack on the Mohawks, but the two nations ultimately signed the Two Row Wampum Treaty of peace and friendship, which "became the basis for all dealings between the Confederacy and the nations of Europe" (p. 121).

This synopsis of the account presented in *Seven Generations* illustrates the level of detail and the breadth of discussion that is frequently provided with the review of events that are deemed to be historically significant to the Kanienkehaka, such as the Second Algonquin War discussed above. The representation presented in *Diverse Pasts* is very brief and general by comparison:

> The founding of Québec marks the beginning of a permanent European presence in Canada. Champlain made alliances with the Montagnais, the Algonquin, and the Huron. Between 1609 and 1616 he accompanied his Native allies on several trips and visited much of what is now southern Québec, eastern Ontario, and parts of New York state. He was an excellent map maker, and maps like the one drawn in 1632 (see figure 3.7) made Canada better known in Europe. (p. 37)

This representation does not contradict the *Seven Generations* account, but it omits a great deal of the discussion topics considered important within the Kanienkehaka account, namely the issues of conflict resolution among Native people, the implications

of the new European approach introduced by Champlain, and the place of the principles of sovereignty in disputes between nations. *Diverse Pasts* does not identify any of these issues or even the fact that warfare was part of Champlain's early experience as an ally of the Native groups named. Instead, he continues to be represented as an explorer who traveled and made maps. In addition to these differences of representation, it should also be noted that *Diverse Pasts* does not make any reference to what *Seven Generations* calls the "Algonquin Wars" and does not provide any discussion of conflicts or historical relations between Native nations prior to European arrival. Unlike *Seven Generations*, which details the history of warfare between the Kanienkehaka and other nations like the Pawnee, Algonquin, Huron and Montagnais nations, *Diverse Pasts* makes the following statements about conflicts between Native peoples:

> Since the concept of territory was vague, groups occupied regions without clear borders. As long as they did not interfere with their neighbours, there was no conflict. (p. 16)
>
> If there was a threat of war, chiefs discussed what to do and prepared war parties. However, since the hunting bands were spread over a vast territory, there was little cause for conflict, so warfare was not an important activity. (p. 23)

This depiction of the absence of conflict between Native groups differs significantly from the representations presented in *Seven Generations*, particularly with respect to disputes between the Iroquois and Algonquin nations over territorial control. It is also important to note that the first excerpt presents a very different representation of territorial boundaries from that presented in *Seven Generations*. Mohawk representations of territorial boundaries and related disputes are discussed in more detail below.

Worldview & Cross-Cultural Contact

Within *Seven Generations*, discourses on Mohawk sovereignty are related to discourses on traditional worldview and the role of the Kanienkehaka to care for and embellish the

Earth. In some instances, Mohawk rights and the principles of the Two Row Wampum are invoked to argue that the people have a right to be involved in decisions about land and resource use, as well as a responsibility to ensure that development is sustainable for the generations yet to come. One example of this discourse from *Seven Generations* is the discussion of Mohawk people's status as Onkwehonwe or "original people" and, consequently, as Aboriginal occupants with "special status" and the right to claim ownership of the land. *Seven Generations* states that "Because this is their land, Mohawk people often feel more strongly than recent immigrants when the land is scarred or made waste by such things as oil spills, strip mining, factory pollution and contaminated waterways," and goes on to state that the Mohawk people, like many other Native peoples, "regarded themselves as having a special responsibility for the earth and the things of the earth" (p. 17). The text goes on to state that "In this way they are very different from European people," but that the Mohawk Creation story is "like the creation story in the Bible in many ways" and that "the Creator inspired all people around the world equally in giving messages to them about how they should behave and relate to the world" (ibid.). This is part of the discourse on worldview which is an important feature of Mohawk historical perspectives.

Worldview is defined within *Seven Generations* as "a term that is used by historians to signify the basic outlook on the world that a group of people have" and as "a combination of the values, attitudes, hopes and aspirations of a people" (p. 2). The discourse of the text reflects the importance that the Iroquois place on the unique worldview and sovereignty of all peoples. Information and examples of concepts make reference to a very wide range of nations and cultures including those of Arabia, Japan, Peru, Germany, Russia, Israel, Mexico, Canada and the United States; and more generally in the continents of South and Central America, Europe, Africa, and Asia.

As has been shown from the discussion of the Kanienkehaka understanding of the principles of the Two Row Wampum, discourses on the sovereignty of nations are very prevalent in *Seven Generations.* The text suggests that sovereignty is central to the political philosophy of the Kanienkehaka and the Iroquois Confederacy, and this is reinforced by the common reference to other peoples as "nations" and to the principles of non-interference in relations between nations. Like sovereignty, world view is also cited throughout *Seven Generations* as a key concept in the study of encounters and conflicts between nations:

> Much of history involves the conflicts between people, nations and races. One of the reasons for this conflict, and a major cause of warfare in the world, is that people often do not take time out to understand the world view of other cultures.
>
> For example, when Europeans settled in the Americas they did not understand the world views of native peoples. For this reason there was conflict between Europeans and native people. This conflict continues to the present day. (p. 2)

> A major difference between Mohawk world view and Euro-American world view can be seen in the section of the creation story after man has been made by the Creator ... **The Different World Views Towards Land By Native People And Europeans Created Misunderstandings.** (p. 15-16)

> There were some European people who understood the symbolic speech of the Mohawk people ... Generally, however, European people did not learn about native people's world view, or about native symbolism. These early Europeans simply thought of the native people as "ignorant savages" and "godless idolaters". There may have been less conflict between native people and Europeans if the Europeans had understood native world view. (p. 28, 30)

> Different societies, having different world views, do not make the same judgements on how to value human achievement. This is true for people around the world including the native nations of the Americas. (p. 100)

> The reason for this European treachery was that the Europeans mistook kindness for weakness. They interpreted gift giving as an act of submission and regarded anything that was not violent as primitive. By the time native people came to understand the world view of the European and could prepare themselves to deal with this particular outlook, whole nations of native people had been exterminated from the face of North America. (p. 110)

> Why did these Europeans think and act in violation of basic principles such as those laid down in the Two Row Wampum Treaty?

> In order to answer this question, it is necessary to reexamine the differences in world view held by the Europeans and the native people of North America. (p. 130)

Each of these excerpts exemplifies the centrality of world view to the Mohawk historical discourse presented in *Seven Generations*. It is important to note that the Mohawk respondents interviewed also consistently pointed to the importance of presenting Mohawk and Native worldviews and philosophies as central themes in provincial history textbooks in order to include their historical perspectives in the mainstream account taught to students.

In *Diverse Pasts*, by contrast, the concept of worldview as a general concept and as an explanation of Native-European conflicts is not developed at any length. Although it is addressed on a few occasions, it is not similarly presented as an underlying principle for understanding the encounters and conflicts between different groups during colonial expansion as it is in *Seven Generations*. In *Diverse Pasts,* comparative discussions of Native and European worldviews refer most frequently to differences in attitudes toward land and territory, as in the following example:

> The Native peoples had a very different attitude toward property than did the Europeans who came later. The Native peoples believed that the Creator gave land to all humanity, not to any individual, so no one could claim the exclusive use of land. Some personal possessions were valued, but accumulating wealth was not important. Instead, generosity was important and people shared with those in need. The prestige that came from generosity meant that people tried to give more than they received. (p. 16)

Although *Seven Generations* does not include an explicit statement about the view of land as property among the Kanienkehaka, it does refer to this as *their land* (p. 17). That said, however, an important distinction between the representation in the above excerpt as compared to the discussion of worldview and attitudes to land in *Seven Generations* is that the latter text emphasizes that Native peoples generally view themselves as caretakers, rather than owners, of land or the Earth (p. 15).

One paragraph in *Diverse Pasts* does outline the importance of worldview in the conflicts between Natives and Europeans, and suggests the types of domination involved in the colonization of North America, although the term colonization is not used:

> The Native peoples had a worldview suited to their environment and way of life. They were tolerant and did not impose their values on others. Europeans, in contrast, wanted complete control over the territory and people where they settled. They believed that they were superior to the Natives and that Christianity was the only true faith. People who did not share their beliefs were considered barbarians and even agents of the devil. Other cultures were judged by European norms. Since the Native peoples did not have European forms of government or religion, they were dismissed as having no culture. The French felt it their duty to "civilize" the Native populations by persuading them to accept Christianity and all other aspects of European culture. This attitude is well reflected in the painting shown in Figure 4.7 [*France Bringing the Faith to New France's Indian*] (p. 52)

The reference to a tolerant and non-imposing approach is consistent with the discourse of *Seven Generations,* and particularly with discourses on the principle of sovereignty and non-interference. Indeed, *Seven Generations* emphasizes in bold text that *Recognizing Sovereignty Requires the Respect of the Individual*, stating that "Individuals of different cultures must recognize each other's sovereignty by respecting each other's culture" (p. 131). This portion of the text is among the most reflective of Native perspectives of history in the mainstream account presented in *Diverse Pasts*. However, the excerpt also exemplifies the discursive differences in the two texts. It still presents Native peoples as a generic and historical "Other" instead of as diverse peoples with equally diverse cultural and national characteristics and historical experiences.

In the paragraphs that follow the above explanation of differences between European and Native worldviews in *Diverse Pasts*, a discussion of French policy aiming to assimilate Native populations is presented:

> The peoples of the St. Lawrence Valley were to learn French and live like Europeans. This policy was not realistic, and assimilation never occurred ... By 1660, the Jesuits realized that they could not make Amerindians into Europeans. The missions continued their work, but with more realistic goals. Missionaries became agents of the Crown and ensured good relations with the nations of the West. (p. 53)

Whereas *Diverse Pasts* suggests that the problem with the policy of assimilation is that it proved to be "unrealistic" and therefore ineffective, an approach more reflective of Mohawk historical perspectives and the discourse presented in *Seven Generations* would likely explain how a policy of assimilation violates the principles of sovereignty.

Mohawk & Eurocentric Bias

As has already been suggested in the analysis above, both texts present a relatively biased perspective of history, one presenting the events of the past from a Kanienkehaka perspective, the other from a European perspective. The key difference between the two is that *Seven Generations* is very explicit in its bias, making it clear and transparent through the narrative which traces the Kanienkehaka's experiences as a group and their attitudes and reactions toward events, whereas *Diverse Pasts* tends to present history from a European perspective that is presented in a neutral voice as though there were no specific cultural perspective being conveyed.

Discussions of the covenant chain further illustrate the Mohawk-centred approached used in *Seven Generations;*. the principles of the covenant chain are frequently cited as they applied to dealings between the Kanienkehaka and European nations. For example:

> **The Europeans Did Not Fully Understand The Covenant Chain.** The idea for the covenant chain was thought up by native people, not by Europeans. The covenant chain represents a modem idea about treaty making that the Europeans did not fully understand. Because of this, some misunderstanding and arguments occasionally broke out between the Confederacy and the Europeans. For example, the French assumed that if the Five Nations made a treaty of peace with the French, they would not make a similar treaty with the English ... Both the French and the English misunderstood the real nature of sovereignty and the meaning of the covenant chain treaties. Therefore, most of the books and speeches written by Europeans in the seventeeth [sic] and eighteenth centuries are written from a position of misunderstanding. (p. 174, 176)

The voice used above and on other occasions, particularly in statements about Europeans, reflects the Mohawk-centered perspective of the text.

In *Diverse Pasts*, on the other hand, the narrative frequently conveys a Eurocentric bias which is presented as though it were universal as opposed to subject to a particular vantage point of interpretation. For instance, the text states that in Canada "during the sixteenth century the main economic activity was the cod fishery" (p. 42). Had the text been more explicit or transparent about its Eurocentric focus, it might have specified that the cod fishery was the main economic activity of European settlers - presumably based on measures of monetary indicators and markets in North America and Europe - and this measure includes the main economic activities of the Native peoples living across Canada (hunting, fishing and harvesting). Another example of Eurocentrism in *Diverse Pasts* is the section title "The Effects of the Conquest," which might better be called "The Effects of the Conquest on French Canada" since there is no discussion of the effects of the conquest on other groups, namely Native nations in Canada (p. 115). This section marks the beginning of the strong focus on the Quebec nationalist movement as a revolt against British domination in Canada.

Another example of how the texts differ in their tendencies to make general, universal claims as opposed to qualified, specified ones is in their respective treatments of the origins of Native peoples in the Americas. In Chapter 3 of *Seven Generations* on origin theories, the Creation Story is presented as "both a literal and symbolic statement that the Kanienkehaka have been in North America for all of time" (p. 32). The chapter presents a number of theories that have been advanced over the years by western scientists and Native people, and concludes that a "large group" of Native people believe the Creation story in a literal way, while "another group" of Native people support the theory of independent evolution, which suggests that different groups of humans evolved

simultaneously on different continents. The chapter also makes clear that Native people do not tend to believe the Bering Strait theory. In this way, the text makes clear that the question of origins is a matter of competing theories rather than privileging any one position on this contentious issue. The observation by Vine Deloria Jr. that Native people treat history and knowledge as being particular to groups, rather than universal, is evident in the way that the issue of origin theories is handled in *Seven Generations*. A number of theories are presented, some of which are discounted as erroneous, but three remain: Native belief in the Creation story, Native belief in the theory of independent evolution, and non-Native belief in the Bering Strait theory. None is presented as more true or plausible than the other - although Native objections to the Bering Strait theory are presented - and no objective indicators are used to attempt the evaluate one theory over another. In *Diverse Pasts* the Bering Strait theory is presented under the heading "The Origins of Native Peoples", an important distinction from the *Seven Generations* heading "Theories on the Origins of Native People". Whereas *Seven Generations* leaves the issue of origins open to discussion, debate, and differences of belief, *Diverse Pasts* presents a pseudo-scientific explanation of the premises of the Bering Strait theory.

In *Diverse Pasts*, the theory is juxtaposed against Indigenous origin stories by alternating between Native views expressed in creation myths and the "facts" of the Bering Strait explanation. For instance, the first paragraph of the sub-section acknowledges that "many Native peoples believe that they originated in North America where the Creator placed them at the beginning of time," and even draws the same parallel to the Genesis story as does *Seven Generations*, but then follows immediately in the second paragraph with "During the last ice age, most of North America was covered by a huge ice cap ... It is generally thought that the ancestors of the Native peoples

crossed over from Asia about 30,000 years ago ..." (p. 8). One might suggest that this juxtaposition is an attempt to balance Native and non-Native explanations of origins, but the effect is that it portrays the Bering Strait theory as scientific fact and Native accounts as stories and myths.

Although the statement that "It is generally thought that the ancestors of the Native peoples crossed over from Asia about 30,000 years ago" does make a qualified claim, as compared to stating that the ancestors of the Native peoples *did* cross over from Asia, the text goes on to outline the theory as though it were a matter of fact. This suggests that what is being qualified is the timeline of Native peoples arrival, rather than whether they actually arrived from Asia. Another statement reads "They crossed the Bering Sea in boats about 4500 years ago and established settlements as far east as Greenland" (ibid.); and the large map indicating "the routes they are thought to have followed" has the caption "The first peoples of Canada crossed over from Asia" (ibid.). Thus, the Bering Strait explanation of Native origins *is* the official explanation according to *Diverse Pasts*, whereas according to *Seven Generations* it is one theory among many, and one that "can not be completely proven" (p. 35).

Within the Native myths included in *Diverse Pasts*, some Mohawk people would argue that *the text* misrepresents the Mohawk Creation story by referring to the twins as "good" and "evil" in a textbox highlighting an excerpt from the story (p. 9). This point was raised by an interview participant who cited the tendency to impose a western Judeo-Christian interpretation on Native symbolism. This participant stated that the significance of the twins was not a question of good and bad, but rather of balance. The version of the Creation story presented in *Seven Generations* does not portray the twins

in terms of the forces of good and evil. Rather, their depiction might be better described as a distinction between the forces of creation and destruction.[18]

Another example of Eurocentric bias in *Diverse Pasts* is the use of place names. The names "Canada" and "Québec" are generally not used in the text prior to the historical establishment with those names, and the text refers to "the remaining British colonies, which we can now call British North America" (p. 123). This suggests that before this period these were unnamed territories, which they may have been for the Europeans but not for the Native peoples who occupied them and claimed them as national territories, as in the case of Kanienkeh for the Mohawk people. Similar language could be used to reflect Mohawk and Native perspectives in the provincial text by referring to "the lands which we now call Quebec and Canada" to reflect the existence of other pre-European organization of the land. An innovation in provincial textbooks would be the inclusion of traditional territorial and regional names (in addition to the names of specific settlements like Hochelaga and Stadacona) in order to represent Iroquois' and other Native peoples' perspectives of history.

Representations of the Iroquois Confederacy

Seven Generations emphasizes the political system of the Iroquois Confederacy and the Great Law of Peace, whereas *Diverse Pasts* omits and 'misrepresents' (relative to *Seven Generations*) the political structure of the Iroquois world. Descriptions of various aspects of political life in Iroquois society are provided in *Diverse Pasts* to indicate that social and political systems were in place before European arrival, such as discussion of the roles of women and chiefs, but no details are provided about the Iroquois

[18] The story of the battle between these two forces resolves with the twin brothers respectively ruling day and night, both of which are integral parts of the natural cycle of the Earth.

Confederacy to present it as a system of governance, and one that remained in effect with the arrival of Europeans.

Diverse Pasts describes the origins, population, economic life, social life, religion and culture, and artistic and cultural life of the "First Peoples" of Québec and Canada, dividing them into Iroquoian, Algonquin and Inuit groups to address their diversity. However, the language is in past tense and describes how Native peoples were, what they did, and how they lived without suggesting that Native communities are still alive and important in the province, or that there has been cultural continuity in spite of social, economic and political changes (p. 4-28). In the final section of *Diverse Pasts*, there is a discussion of the contemporary reality of Native communities in Quebec, but this reads as an add-on when several chapters prior to this have discussed the emergence of modern Quebec society and made reference to a variety of aspects of society "today" without ever mentioning Native peoples.

A similar comparison can be drawn between the two texts' representations of the significance of the Longhouse in Iroquois societies. In discussing the use of symbolism in Iroquois diplomacy, *Seven Generations* explains that:

> The Iroquois referred to themselves as the Hotinonsionne, or the People of the Longhouse. The Longhouse was itself a symbol of the Confederacy. Therefore, when the Seneca speaker here refers to the "whole house" he is referring to the whole Confederacy. What he means to say is that he is speaking for the whole of the Confederacy. He also refers to the Europeans as being in the house. By this he means to invite them into the life of peace brought upon by the Great Law of Peace of the Five Nations Confederacy. (p. 24-25)

In contrast to this explanation of "the Longhouse" as a political institution central to diplomatic relations between nations, *Diverse Pasts* describes "longhouses" as the homes of Iroquois people, detailing their structure and dimensions, number of occupants, etc. (p. 19). The omission of references to the political structure of the Iroquois is made

clear in the following caption, which appears under an image of naked Iroquois women and children in a longhouse:

> Longhouses had few interior divisions. People worked, played, ate and slept in them. Note the different products stored around the house. Research the main differences between a longhouse and European homes of the 1600s (p. 20)

The depictions of Iroquois political life in subsequent pages make no reference to the Longhouse as a political institution or to the basic principles of the Iroquois Confederacy and the Great Law of Peace. This is in spite of the fact that the timeline at the beginning of the Unit identifies "Foundation of Iroquois League" in 1459 as a significant event in the history of Canada and Quebec (p. 3). *Diverse Pasts does make* reference to the political role of the Longhouse in Iroquois society in discussions of the internal divisions during the Oka Crisis, but without any context or elaboration on the political structure of the Mohawk community:

> Mohawk society was deeply divided. The militant Warrior Society and the traditionalists of the Longhouse vied for control with the elected band council. Traditional Mohawk values stress consensus, but this was impossible to achieve with emotions running so high. (p. 397)

There is a noteworthy reference to cultural values here, and the term 'Mohawk society' conveys the distinctiveness of the Mohawk people vis-à-vis other Québecers in a way that reinforces the notion of them as a 'distinct minority' with distinct institutions. However, the absence of any elaboration on the political system exemplifies the ambiguity of the text's acknowledgement of Mohawk status as an independent political community.

The two texts also present very different representations of the significance of wampum for the Iroquois people in their dealings with other nations. The following explanation is taken from *Seven Generations*' explanation of symbolism in the speeches and diplomatic affairs of the Iroquois Confederacy's chiefs:

> When the people of the Five Nations wanted to seal a bargain they laid down a belt of wampum. Oftentimes the design on the belts symbolized the business of the council. European people liked to write things down in books. Therefore, for every treaty there should be a wampum belt that shows the native side of the story. Whenever there is a so-called treaty that does not include a belt, in all likelihood it was not a real treaty. Laying down the wampum, therefore, meant sealing a bargain. (p. 24)

This stands in stark contrast to what one might call the 'apolitical' representation of wampum as an art form in *Diverse Pasts*:

> The Iroquoians developed a high level of artistic achievement ... Wampum was another important artistic form. Wampum was a belt or necklace made of different-coloured shells sewn together that was exchanged by parties to every treaty. You can judge the beauty of some of these items for yourself by looking carefully at the artifacts in figure 2.11. (*Figure 2.11 - Some examples of Iroquoian art*) (p. 26-27)

Although it is acknowledged that wampum were used in treaty making processes, their characterization primarily as an art-form rather than a system of official record keeping makes it seem as though wampum were exchanged as gifts rather than created as contracts within treaty negotiations. This stands in stark contrast to the picture included in *Seven Generations*, which shows six Mohawk men formally dressed, with the caption "Six Nations Chiefs read wampum of the Confederacy" (p. 400).

Another example of differences in representations of Iroquois approaches to forging agreements and alliances is the covenant chain:

> The covenant chain is a term applied to the relationship of the Iroquois and the English, and eventually the Iroquois and the French. It was a way of peacefully dealing with misunderstandings about land, military alliances and trade. (p. 173-74)

Whereas *Seven Generations* refers frequently throughout the text to the reciprocal commitments and responsibilities represented by the covenant chain, highlighting it as a central mechanism in Iroquois-European political dealings, it is never mentioned in *Diverse Pasts*. This may be related to the suggestion, according to the Mohawk text, that the concept was never well understood by Europeans.

Representations of Time & Chronology

Before turning to the analysis of how the roles of women and chiefs are represented, it is important to address a final observation about representations of the Iroquois Confederacy in the two texts that provide a good example of the different emphasis placed on time and chronology between the two texts, as suggested in the works of Smith (1999) and Deloria (1994, 1997). The greater emphasis on chronology within western historiography is exemplified by the number of timelines in *Diverse Pasts*, illustrating the importance placed on tracking the evolution of historical periods, as well as the references to archaeological estimates. Timelines have their own textbox in *Diverse Pasts* (p. 11) and are mentioned repeatedly in the body of the text, exercises, and review questions. *Seven Generations* does not identify the timeframe in which the Confederacy was established, except to say that it occurred after the north-eastward migration of the Iroquois out of the mound cities of south-central North America (p. 54).

A good example of the importance placed on chronology, measurement and ranking within *Diverse Pasts,* which may be understood as an expression of western approaches to history, is found in the following exercise presented beneath a map of French explorations in North America, 1667-1743:

> Make a time line showing when the trips marked on this map occurred. Divide your line into three periods to show the most active, the second-most active, and the least-active periods (p. 52)

In the Mohawk text, there are no timelines and dates are provided inconsistently, perhaps according to availability as more dates are included as the text proceeds to contemporary times. Yet, the absence of definitive dates and chronologies is not presented as problematic and there are no attempts to speculate or estimate using other dates which are confirmed. Instead, as suggested by Vine Deloria Jr., the emphasis remains on the significance of the event on the overall evolution of the Kanienkehaka and how the event relates to more recent development and inter-group relations.

Political Roles of Women & Chiefs

While *Diverse Pasts* is consistent with *Seven Generations* in that it identifies some of the same key features of Iroquois social and political structures - such as the clan system and the matriarchal and matrilineal organization of society – it also misrepresents certain information if you compare it to Mohawk historical accounts. For example, it is stated that "While clan mothers chose the chiefs, the councils were made up of men, and women do not seem to have had a direct say in political decisions" (p. 23). *Seven Generations* presents a different image of the role of women in political life:

> The Kanienkehaka were a matrilineal society. The power of the society rested in the women. The lands were owned by the women. Only with the permission of the women could the lands be sold. (p. 361)

> **The Women Of Kahnawake And Akwesasne Petitioned Ottawa Without Success**. A year later, there was a new Minister of Indian Affairs. The women of Kahnawake decided to try again. They wrote to the Honourable Clifford Sifton ... The clanmothers of Akwesasne took up what was to be their last petition before swinging into action. On June 2nd, 1898, they wrote the governor general ... (p. 367-8)

> Women and children were motioned to one corner of the House, but a place of honor in that section was given to two white-haired tribal mothers of Caughnawaga, whose counsel is weighty and heard with respect, even by the Grand Chief himself. (p. 414, excerpt from an article in the Gazette in 1927)

However, *Seven Generations* also includes representations of the changing experience of women in the social and political life of Mohawk communities in the following excerpt of the Great Depression experience of "an old woman from Akwesasne" (p. 421):

> My uncle Sose's wife's mother was an old clanmother and she told us a lot about the way it used to be. I never knew how smart old ladies could be. Now I'm an old lady, and nobody thinks about me. Well, times are different. That there was during the depression. (p. 423)

According to *Seven Generations*, not only did the sale of lands traditionally require the permission of the women, the consent of the Confederacy and of the people were also

required, as will be seen below. This issue is of particular relevance to the comparison of how Joseph Brant is represented in both texts. According to *Diverse Pasts*,

> Thayendanega (also known as Joseph Brant) was a Mohawk who had been born in the Ohio Valley in 1742 or 1743 ... Thayendanega was a war chief but was not the leading Mohawk *sachem* (ruler or chief). However, he was involved in the negotiations in which the Saint Regis and Kahnawake Mohawks gave up their claims in New York State for reserves in Canada (p. 126)

This description is not consistent with Mohawk representations in *Seven Generations*. First, the statement that he was not "the leading Mohawk sachem" erroneously suggests that there was one chief when the traditional political structure was composed of councils of many chiefs. For example, an excerpt from *Seven Generations* below refers to a sale of lands that required the signature of 65 chiefs. Second, *Seven Generations* includes the results of an investigation carried out by Major Gordon Smith of Brantford, which states, "that [Brant] was not an official war chief is established by the fact that he was of Mohawk and not of Seneca descent" (p. 280), as is the custom within the Confederacy. Finally, and most importantly for understanding the differences in the two texts' discourses on sovereignty, Brant is depicted in *Seven Generations* as a traitor to the Mohawk people for having ceded lands to the British when he had no authority to do so[19]:

> **Brant Had One Foot In The Canoe And The Other Foot In The Boat ...**
> This position, trying to be an Onkwehonwe and a white man, was against the wisdom of the Two Row Wampum Treaty. Brant had led a large group of the Kanienkehaka against the Americans in the War of Independence. He did this against the wishes of the warrior's council, against the wishes of the Mohawk Nation and against the wishes of the Grand Council. (p. 263-4)
>
> The first and only legitimate sale of Mohawk lands occured [sic] in 1788. The deed of this sale of land was signed by sixty five Mohawk chiefs surrendering some territory along the Mohawk River to the United States. This deed was a legitimate sale. It was signed by the chiefs and witnessed by Colonel John Butler and Joseph Brant. Brant was not a chief. If he had been a chief he would have been one of the men to sign the deed and not merely to witness it. (p. 275)

[19] This view of Brant was also stated by a research participant during an interview in Montreal in August 2004.

> In 1798, the United States government approached Brant and asked him to sell the Mohawk land in New York ... Brant claimed that he had the authority to do this from the Grand Council ... This fraudulent sale was only the beginning for Brant. He was soon selling off Mohawk lands in the Six Nations reserve, as well as New York. Brant had no authority to sell the lands of New York. The 1798 treaty with Brant is illegal. Brant knew this. He acted as an individual without the knowledge or the authority of the people. (p. 279-80)

These excerpts illustrate the extent of differences in the two discourses: in *Diverse Pasts*, Brant has a marginal role in the historical narrative but is depicted as a key negotiator, whereas in *Seven Generations* he is named repeatedly and depicted as a traitor for his involvement in illegitimate land transfers.

An important difference between the two texts is that *Diverse Pasts* provides relatively little explanation of the means by which Europeans came to control the land and resources of the Iroquois while *Seven Generations* devotes an entire chapter to the issue of lands and frequently cites Kanienkehaka claims to territorial control. In *Diverse Pasts*, the discussion of Brant's role in land sales is one of the only direct discussions of these matters. At the national level, a map is included to show the treaties signed across the national territory. However, the claims of Native people in disputed areas are not discussed, even in the few cases where references to "Native claims" are made.[20] By contrast, *Seven Generations* provides ongoing references to the principles of sovereignty which are the basis for the legitimacy of the Confederacy, its member nations, and their claims to territory and political independence from Britain and France.

Discussion

Linda Smith (1999) argues that the production of knowledge about Indigenous peoples, including that in textbooks, is a perpetuation of colonialism through the exercise of power over lands, minds and histories. The analysis of the two texts illustrates how mainstream education contributes to the perpetuation and normalization of colonialism

[20] Disputed areas are identified on maps but are not discussed in the text.

through the renaming of lands (using non-Native place names) and representations of Natives as pre-contact societies who have a peripheral or predominantly negative role in the expansion of Quebec and Canadian society. The exercise of power over minds and histories described by Smith is exemplified in the exclusion of Native perspectives of events and issues in *Diverse Pasts*.

Seven Generations is also characterized by ambivalence in its depiction of European people. The language of us–and-them is used in most cases where Europeans are distinctly identified as the Other but there are examples where parallels are drawn as in the similarities highlighted between the Creation story and the Bible. More generally, there is a variation between discourses of respect for European cultures and societies (through acknowledgement of the sovereignty of nations and of their rights to govern their own affairs without interference) and discourses of disdain toward European cultures and societies (through representations of them as violent, land hungry and treacherous).

The Self-Other dichotomy embodied in representations of Mohawk- or Native-European relations in both texts contributes to the type of national identity formation described by Vincent and Arcand (1979). *Seven Generations* contributes to the national identity and culture of Mohawk students through the reiteration of principles of world view, sovereignty, and territorial claims, and of how these are distinct from those held by other nations. In presenting history from a Eurocentric perspective, the language used in *Diverse Pasts* presents Native people as Other, thereby contributing to the identity formation of those Quebecois students who identify with a European subject position. The dichotomies presented in both texts are examples of the dividing practices described by Foucault (1983), wherein discourses mediate knowledge of ourselves and others through polarized understandings of groups.

Linda Smith (1999) argues that chronology makes events "real" by locating them temporally and thereby allowing tracking of progress and development within western historiography. Diverse Pasts' emphasis on timelines and dating of events illustrates how the historical account embodies the western approach outlined by Smith. Historical phenomena are situated temporally more so than other contextual features, as seen in the examples of events shown on timelines without discussion in the texts, including the establishment of the Iroquois Confederacy and the Peace of 1701. The use of timelines also shows the approach to tracking development identified by Smith in that history is presented as the progress of societies through stages of development in various eras. This stands in contrast to the absence of timelines and emphasis on chronological order in Seven Generations. The distinction between the texts suggests an important difference between mainstream and Native approaches regarding what is important about history, where the former emphasizes when and the latter emphasizes why events occur. This illustrates Deloria's assertion that for Native peoples chronology is of little importance and that what is important is what happened and its impact on the people (1994: 98-103).

Both Daniel Francis (1992) and Bruce Trigger (1985) have illustrated the ambiguity of non-Native historians' depictions of the role of Native peoples in the history of North America and the development of Canada. The textual analysis illustrates how this ambiguity continues to characterize representations of Native peoples in non-Native historical accounts. This is true of the representations of Native peoples' political status (they are alternately characterized as nations, groups, distinct minorities, etc. and demands for self-government are acknowledged but not explained) and of their claims to territories (prior occupancy and disputes over land are acknowledged but British, French and Canadian claims to control are generally not questioned or evaluated). These issues are discussed further in the additional analysis that follows in the next chapter.

CHAPTER 5: Representations of Colonization & Resistance

Historical Motives and Rationale

Perhaps the most striking difference in the historical discourses of the two texts is their use of what Fairclough calls "additions," that is, what is added to representations in the form of explanation, legitimation and evaluation (Fairclough, 2003). Generally speaking, the narrative structure of *Diverse Pasts* is designed to address a very wide range of historical information from a number of perspectives including basic descriptions of events, artifacts, etc., as well as social and political issues arising from differences of class and culture in Quebec and Canada. In a sense the text must be all things to all people, which is no easy task and which, ultimately, detracts from its descriptive and analytical strength. Overall, *Diverse Pasts* omits explanations of the legitimacy or source of European rights to control lands, resources, and peoples, and evades discussions of Iroquois resistance.

Seven Generations, on the other hand, is not meant to be all things to all people. Its purpose is to represent a Mohawk perspective of history. As a result, it presents relatively detailed accounts of the confrontations and diplomatic measures involved in transfers of territory and political power away from the Iroquois and into the hands of the French and British. As will be shown, the degree of detail and abstraction included in discussions of various topics in *Diverse Pasts* is inconsistent, both between and within topics, and this is particularly true of explanations, legitimations, and evaluations of historical phenomena and social issues. The specific focus in this analysis is on how these additions are used in representations of Europeans' claims to territory and political control over Native peoples, and on Native peoples' reactions to these claims, always with a particular focus on the Iroquois nations. Generally speaking, *Seven Generations* provides a tightly woven narrative which covers a wide range of topics within the history

of the Kanienkehaka, while presenting a consistent reiteration of a few specific themes: namely the principles of Kanienkehaka nationhood and sovereignty, and the distinctiveness, pride and strength of the people and their heritage.

Explanations of Colonial Control Over Native Peoples

It is curious that within *Diverse Pasts*, the Iroquois are the only specific Native peoples, and Native peoples are the only specific ethnic/social/cultural group, to be identified in legislation and treaties outlining governmental jurisdiction and control:

> France's North American empire started to crumble after the Treaty of Utrecht, which recognized British control over Hudson Bay, Newfoundland, Acadia, and the Iroquois (p.133).
>
> Section 91 of the British North America Act outlined the central government's powers. Of particular importance was the federal government's responsibility for defence, criminal law, Native peoples, and matters connected to money and banking. (p. 220)

The fact that the Iroquois are the only specific nation identified in colonial legislation speaks to their significance in the conquest of North America and illustrates the capacity of discourse to reflect social power relations. The discursive construction of the Iroquois as British subjects through documented colonial policy had a first-hand effect in power relations by dictating international relations between European and Iroquois nations, although it does this not by articulating the *basis* for control of a sovereign people but by establishing a *claim* to control. The discourse of colonial policy also has a secondary effect by identifying the Iroquois to students as a group requiring surveillance and regulation by a foreign government, and by equating them with other territorial "possessions". This claim within the historical discourse taught to young Quebecers, albeit poorly substantiated, still has the potential to produce actual effects in today's society to the extent that it shapes public opinion about the Iroquois and their contemporary claims to sovereignty.

It is interesting to note that in *Diverse Pasts*, the language used to describe the French government's relationship with Native peoples is more respectful of them as equals than that of the British. Whereas the description of the distribution of responsibilities in the government of New France refers to "Relations with Native peoples" (p. 75), references to the British government always use the language of "control over" the Iroquois, and eventually Native people and lands more generally. For example:

> The War of Spanish Succession (1701-13) marked an important change. France lost the war both in America and in Europe and had to cede its claims over vast territories in the Treaty of Utrecht (see figure 8.1) ... Finally, *France had to recognize British control over the Iroquois and all their lands*. This meant that British-American traders from New York would have access to the Great Lakes region. (p. 103, emphasis added)

> France's North American empire started to crumble after the Treaty of Utrecht, which recognized British control over Hudson Bay, Newfoundland, Acadia, and the Iroquois (p.133).

It seems that some explanation is warranted as to how the outcomes regarding British control over Iroquois people and their lands that are now the Eastern provinces of Canada were arrived at. Yet, no such explanation is provided and the previous reference to the Iroquois is twenty pages earlier, when they are described as having martyred French Jesuits.

According to *Diverse Pasts,* the Royal Proclamation of 1763 created the new British colony of Québec along the St. Lawrence from Gaspé to Akwesasne (p. 133). The Royal Proclamation "established" control over territory, land and resources across north-eastern North America, and control over the Native nation with whom an alliance had been established. This relates back to the question of the inclusion and omission of details regarding the transfer of rights to land and the jurisdiction of French and British royal governments. And although *Diverse Pasts* acknowledges the Iroquois as historical actors with agency by stating that in 1701 the "Peace of Montréal guarantees Iroquois

neutrality" (p. 59), the nation-to-nation basis of that resolution as a treaty of peace and friendship is not explained. In *Seven Generations*, on the other hand, representations of the roles and perspectives of the French and the Kanienkehaka are included, and they are depicted as sovereign nations, each with their respective interests in reaching peace:

> Finally on August 4, 1701 all of the nations of the Confederacy traveled to Montreal where they signed a treaty of peace and friendship with the French. They welcomed the French and their allies into the covenant chain. The Confederacy promised to remain neutral in the struggle between the French and the English.
>
> The French welcomed the treaty of 1701. The fur trade that kept New France alive, had been reduced since the outbreak of war in the middle of the seventeeth [sic] century. This trade could now be resumed with the Iroquois at peace ...
>
> The peace of 1701 was welcomed by the Iroquois. They had successfully defended their territory during the Iroquois Wars and through the period of treachery by Denonville, Kryn and Frontenac. However, many warriors had been killed and property destroyed. (p. 179)

Thus, while the two texts' are not contradictory in their representations of Iroquois neutrality with the peace of 1701, the discourses presented are extremely different in their additions of explanations and contextualization of that peace agreement.

In *Diverse Pasts*, the timeline at the beginning of Unit 5 indicates three major developments in the struggle for Mohawk and other Native nations' sovereignty:

> 1870s "violence characterizes struggle between Natives and Sulpicians over religion and power at Kanesatake"
> 1876 "Indian Act aims at assimilation of Natives into white society"
> 1880 "federal ministry of Indian Affairs established" (p. 213)

Although it is encouraging to see these issues addressed in the text, none of them is discussed again in the text. *Seven Generations*, on the other hand, presents several chapters about the Indian Act, its impacts on the Kanienkehaka, and their efforts at resistance. As will be seen later, one of the major issues addressed is Mohawk resistance to Canadian and American citizenship and the imposition of 'Indian Act elections', the election of political leaders using the Canadian government's system instead of that of the Iroquois Confederacy. The following excerpts of *Seven*

Generations illustrate two discursive styles used in the text to provide information about the assimilation of Native peoples as Canadian citizens:

> These Kanienkehaka moved to Lake St. Anne, fifty miles from Edmonton, Alberta. Here they accepted a 25,600 acre reserve. They signed Treaty no. 6 with the Canadian government, guaranteeing the protection of their lands as an Indian reserve in Canada. The reserve land had been reduced from its original 25,600 acres to 15,485 by 1928. Finally, on March 31, 1958 the remaining members of Michel's band became enfranchised by Order in Council P. C. 1958-375. From that time on the Kanienkehaka of Michel's Band have been considered Canadian citizens, and their reserve a municipality. (p. 293)

> In 1876 the Parliament of Canada passed the Indian Act. It is this law which has exerted the most outside influence on native nations. The purpose of the Indian Act was to weaken the power and prestige of traditional native government, to remove women of the nations from positions of power, to give native people Canadian citizenship, and to gradually terminate all claims of native people to lands in Canada.
>
> The Mohawk Nation had never surrendered as a defeated nation to the Canadian government. Therefore, the Canadian government had no right to interfere with the administration or governing of Mohawk settlements. The Kanienkehaka would have to ask to be under the Indian Act in order to come under its jurisdiction. (p. 362)

The first excerpt provides considerable detail about the process by which the western Kanienkehaka lost their autonomy and land-base as Native peoples, while the second is a more broad analysis of the impact of federal Indian policy and the response it received from the Mohawk people. The second excerpt reiterates once again the Mohawk discourse on sovereignty that is presented throughout *Seven Generations* and illustrates the text's tendency to infuse historical information with critical analysis and interpretation.

Explanations of Iroquois Hostilities & Grievances

From the first mention of Iroquois hostility toward Europeans and other Native groups around page 50 of *Diverse Pasts*, there is never any explanation provided of their reasons for engaging in armed conflict, whether grievances, claims, ambitions, etc. In this way, Iroquois perspectives of their own role in armed conflicts and disputes are not included in *Diverse Pasts*. By the end of Unit I, *Diverse Pasts* has presented the

occupation of North America as the outcome of fur trade expansion and pressures from European governments to establish settlements and colonies.

Although it is acknowledged that most of North America was occupied as Native land prior to European arrival, and that specific territories were occupied by the Iroquois nations, there are only a handful of references to their resistance. Representations of resistance in *Diverse Pasts* are discussed at more length below, but first a discussion of the other ways that the text explains the historical role of the Iroquois during colonization as compared to the discourses and explanations presented in *Seven Generations* is provided.

In *Diverse Pasts*, the Iroquois are presented as key players in the fur trade, but their role in warfare is rarely explained in terms of their motivations or rationale for conflict. At best it is implied that they were motivated by wanting their share of the profits of the trade. No mention is made of their involvement in warfare as an assertion of sovereignty or territorial claims. For example:

> As soon as the danger of disease lessened, the fur trade was thrown into turmoil because of war with the Iroquois between 1641 and 1666. In 1639 the Dutch started to trade firearms to the Iroquois for furs. With the advantage in numbers and arms, the Iroquois then began attacking fur convoys on their way to Montréal. Intense war resulted, and between 1648 and 1653 the Iroquois dispersed all of the nations living in what is now southern Ontario (p. 46)

> By 1680, New France had expanded across almost half the continent. This expansion brought the colony into conflict with the English and their Iroquois allies. By moving into the Mississippi, the French cut off the Iroquois' main supply of furs. Iroquois war parties started attacking French traders in the West in 1681, and by 1689 they were ravaging settlements near Montréal. This war lasted until 1701. (p. 51)

The wars fought between the French and Iroquois are not explained at any length, but the main message that is conveyed through the discourse is that the Iroquois were the instigators of confrontations, and that they posed an ongoing threat. Below is an example of how *Diverse Pasts* describes the role of the Iroquois in the death of

French Jesuits, exemplifying their characterization as a violent threat and providing no context:

> The Jesuits became famous for their missionary work, especially in Huronia, where Father Jean de Brébeuf and three of his companions suffered martyrdom at the hands of the Iroquois in 1648-49. The Jesuit college at Québec (see figure 6.5), founded in 1635, was the first postsecondary educational institution in America north of Mexico (p. 81-2)

By never explaining Iroquois perspectives of the causes and catalysts of these attacks and hostilities, *Diverse Pasts* discursively constructs the Iroquois as the perpetrators of random acts of violence, liable to attack at any time without reason or warning. The language used to characterize the Iroquois in the first two references above is significantly more aggressive than the characterization of the French in the same passages, where they are described as having "expanded", "moved" and "cut off" the Iroquois supply of furs.

According to the account presented in *Seven Generations*, the issue was not only interference with fur trade activity, but more importantly the encroachment onto Mohawk territory, which also implied an attack on national sovereignty for the Kanienkehaka. For example:

> De Tracy took the Mohawk message for peace as a surrender. He then started to construct forts along Lake Champlain, well within Kanienkeh.
>
> The Kanienkehaka attacked these forts, to let it be known that such an invasion would not be tolerated. The Kanienkehaka then sent another delegation to the French to resume peace talks. A member of this delegation, a Mohawk war chief by the name of Agariata, was captured and killed. (p. 148)

Another example of how *Seven Generations* represents the Iroquois role in conflicts with Europeans and the Native allies of the French illustrates an aspect of the story that is completely absent from the account presented in *Diverse Pasts* – both the particularity of the nations of the Iroquois (not just a homogenous group), their presentation of claims and grievances, and active role in negotiating peaceful resolutions:

> The French could invade Kanienkeh and burn villages, but they could not establish any permanent forts in the country without the agreement and permission of the Kanienkehaka. The French knew this, and they also knew that the Confederacy still controlled the waterways of the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence River ... From late 1666 until 1701 the Iroquois and the French engaged in a series of negotiations of peace. Preliminary agreements were reached by the Seneca, Cayuga, Onondaga and Oneida in 1666. The Kanienkehaka negotiated the following year, and by 1667 a general peace was established between the people of the Five Nations and the French government at Quebec. (p. 149-50)

The timeline at the beginning of Unit 2 in *Diverse Pasts* shows that 1667 marked "Peace with the Iroquois" and that in 1701 the "Peace of Montréal guarantees Iroquois neutrality" (p. 59). There is no further discussion of the context or events leading up to these reconciliations. Similarly, in Unit 5 when the timeline indicates that in the 1870s "Violence characterizes struggle between Natives and Sulpicians over religion and power at Kanesatake" (p. 213), there is no discussion in the chapters of the Unit or anywhere else in the text. This is surprising considering that the text does go on to discuss the Mohawk claims during the Oka Crisis, so what better occasion to lay the groundwork for understanding the historical context of the armed conflict in 1990? The coverage of the Oka Crisis is discussed further below.

Whereas *Diverse Pasts* only makes reference to Iroquois hostilities without explaining the events leading up to the Peace of 1701 with the Iroquois, *Seven Generations* devotes three chapters (a total of almost fifty pages) to the Iroquois Wars fought against the French, Huron and Algonquin and specific encounters leading up to the Peace of 1667 and later the Peace of 1701. The chapters in *Seven Generations* present the sequence of battles, retreats, and attempts at peace, and the Mohawk perspective of what those events meant for the Kanienkeh territory and Kanienkehaka control of lands. Not surprisingly, the text depicts the Iroquois Wars as a series of Mohawk victories followed by attempts at making peace with the French, led by Oneida and Onandaga delegations representing the Confederacy (p. 147).

Returning to the specific issue of representations Iroquois motives and rationales, from the Mohawk perspective presented in *Seven Generations*, they were fighting to assert their existing claims to Kanienkeh, the Mohawk territory spanning from the Great Lakes to the St. Lawrence valley – not for furs. The difference in the historical accounts is excessively clear if we compare the excerpt above to the introductory section on the Iroquois Wars in *Seven Generations*:

> **The Iroquois Fought To Control The Trade On The St. Lawrence**. From 1608 until 1666 the Iroquois were forced to fight four wars with the French and the native allies of the French. The principle allies of the French were the Huron, Algonquin, Ottawa and Montagnais nations. These wars are referred to as the Iroquois Wars. The Iroquois were defending their rights to control the travel and trade on the St. Lawrence River. They expressed their right to trade with either the Dutch or French, and to accept or reject the prices that were offered for their furs. The French wanted to eliminate the Iroquois and gain a total monopoly of the fur trade. (p. 137-38)

This illustrates how the principles of sovereignty are reiterated throughout *Seven Generations*: independence, as a feature of sovereignty, is expressed through the right to trade, and the importance of *territory* to sovereignty is expressed through the right to control trade and travel on national territory. This claim to territory is also well-established through discussion of migrations, settlements, and the boundaries of Kanienkeh.

In addition to illustrating the differences in the two texts' representations of the events, the *Seven Generations* excerpt also exemplifies the tendency of the text to represent the reasons for the actions of various groups. This stands in contrast to the *Diverse Pasts* statement that "the Iroquois then began attacking fur convoys," which is presented without any elaboration of the context or rationale for their actions. Although one might argue that the objectivity of the historian as a social scientist is at issue in these omissions, there are numerous other instances where the motives and rationale of historical actors are included to explain or contextualize statements about other groups

in *Diverse Pasts.* For example, in a section on the American Revolution, *Diverse Pasts* provides a relatively full explanation of the reasons for American unrest:

> Unrest in the Thirteen Colonies continued to grow. The Americans did not want to pay British war debts or the costs of keeping the British army in America. They protested that no one should be taxed without representation, and since they had no members in the British Parliament, they felt that it had no right to tax them. (p. 121)

This section makes clear assertions about the rationale for American resistance to taxation and political control by the British, in much the same manner that *Seven Generations* explains the reasons for Iroquois resistance to the control asserted by the French and the British in North America.

Although both texts acknowledge the conflict over the fur trade, what is made abundantly clear in the Mohawk text but is not addressed at all in *Diverse Pasts* are the systems of territorial control that were in place prior to European arrival. Within the Mohawk historical discourse, the disputed area of land remained under the governing authorities of the Great Law of Peace, as executed by the Kanienkehaka and other nations of the Confederacy. Thus, the Iroquois Wars were only superficially about control of the fur trade; more fundamentally, from the perspective of the Mohawk discourses, they were a matter of national sovereignty.

Explanations of Territorial Control

The historical discourse in the provincial text reflects and reinforces the fact that claims to Canada were established among European nations without regard to Native societies. However, by presenting European claims without critical discussion, the text contributes to the perpetuation of a Eurocentric understanding of history and legitimation of colonialism. If we consider the text through the lens of Fairclough's analytical framework, it is apparent that *Seven Generations* provides a more concrete and detailed account by focusing on specific social events to which we can answer the questions: Who? Where?

When? Why? *Diverse Pasts* is especially weak in providing explanations of *why* — e.g. Why did the British have to quell the Iroquois? Why were the Iroquois attacking settlements?

As has been shown above, Iroquois actions against European interests in *Diverse Pasts* are described using a discourse of warfare, whereas colonial actions against Iroquois interests are described in the language of expansion or interference, as opposed to invasion or encroachment upon Iroquois territory. The latter descriptions would be more consistent with Mohawk and Iroquois representations of the events of this historical period. For example, *Seven Generations* states that:

> By 1676 the French were penetrating into the territory of the Five Nations. The Five Nations responded by attacking the Algonquin nations that supported the French. In 1680 the Iroquois attacked the Miami and Illinois. These two nations together with the Wyandot, petitioned the new Governor of New France, Joseph Antoine de La Barre, to come to their aid. (p. 168)

> In 1768 the Confederacy made a treaty at Fort Stanwix with the British. This treaty guaranteed that Iroquois lands would not be invaded and that the sovereignty of the Confederacy would be respected ... The colonists did not agree with the treaty at Fort Stanwix. They wanted to expand into Iroquois land. (p. 258)

> At first the United States tried to trick the Six Nations into selling their lands. The Seneca, Cayuga, Onondaga, Tuscarora and Oneida were all swindled into selling their lands. However, the Kanienkehaka refused to sign any deals. (p. 271)

> The Mohawk lands in the Adirondacks and on the western shore of Lake Champlain are still legal lands of the Kanienkehaka. The United States government stole these lands through two fraudulent treaties, the 1796 Seven Indian Nations of Canada Treaty and the 1798 treaty with Joseph Brant. (p. 280)

Throughout *Diverse Pasts*, there are several references to the threat of Iroquois attacks that are not substantiated with any discussion of Iroquois interests, grievances, or other motives, not to mention what European land seizures they might have been retaliating against. For example:

> One of the basic institutions of New France was the seigneury. All the lands in New France had been given as a seigneury to the Company of One

> Hundred Associates in 1627 ... The plots of land granted to the habitants ... enabled the first settlers to have access to the river, but made their houses difficult to defend in the event of Iroquois attacks. (p. 77)

For readers who are knowledgeable about Iroquois historical perspectives, this passage could suggest that the Iroquois attacked settlements because the Government of France had claimed the authority to "give" the lands as a seigneury to the Company, and presumably these lands were in the region that was formerly recognized by Europeans as Mohawk or Iroquois territory (as would have been indicated by the maps presented in *Diverse Pasts* prior to French claims to these areas). Yet no discussion of the connections between French colonization efforts and Iroquois attacks is presented, leaving most readers without knowledge of this historical interpretation. Furthermore, the last mention of the Iroquois prior to this statement was fourteen pages earlier and dealt with the settlement of the Mohawks with the Jesuits and Sulpicians at Kahnawake and Kanesatake respectively (p. 63), which also does not provide any context for understanding Iroquois motives or rationale for opposing or attacking European settlements.[21]

The depiction that the Iroquois population "dispersed" into "what is now southern Ontario" in *Diverse Pasts* (p. 46) differs from *Seven Generations* in that it does not acknowledge that the Iroquois considered this to be part of their territory, suggesting that this was their first occupation or claim to that area, and excluding Iroquois historical perspectives. In *Seven Generations* it is made clear through accounts of migrations and the resettlement of various areas that the Mohawk moved across various parts of their territory depending on warfare and other factors:

---

[21] It should be noted that at the end of the chapter preceding the passage above, students are asked to conduct research to "compare the life of an adult male Native at Oka in 1730 to that of one in Huronia in 1600" including "the physical structure of the village, the work done, and the authority figures in these settlements" (p. 72). Although this passage does not help students understand Iroquois perspectives, their research might.

> By 1608 Champlain had relocated most of the French trading activities to the Quebec area.
>
> During this time the Kanienkehaka had pulled back from the northern most part of Kanienkeh. This was probably due to the war with the Algonquin. This practice is customary among nations that have a great deal of territory to defend in a time of war. The northern part of Kanienkeh was the scene of most of the fighting between the Kanienkehaka and the Algonquin. (p. 117)

> **The Resettlement Of Northern Kanienkeh** The territory of Kanienkeh stretched from Montreal island to the Mohawk River ... Westward, the Kanienkehaka were in possession of vast hunting grounds all the way west to the Schoharie Creek.
>
> Because of the years of war with the French and their allies from 1608 until 1667, the Kanienkehaka had not occupied their full territory. (p. 152)

> Now that peace was established with the French, it was possible for the Kanienkehaka to reoccupy their national territory. There were three reasons for resettling the northern territory. These reasons were political, economic and religious. (p. 153)

> During the period of warfare known as the Iroquois Wars, it became necessary for the Kanienkehaka to pull back from the extreme edges in their territory and to concentrate their settlements in the Mohawk Valley. The northern part of Kanienkeh was left undefended and unsettled from shortly before Champlain's arrival in North America until the time of the Peace of 1667. Between 1667 and 1701 the Kanienkehaka resettled the northern part of Kanienkeh by settling at Kahnawake. (p. 202)

The statement that the movement to Kahnawake was a matter of resettlement of Mohawk territory stands in contrast to the discourse used in *Diverse Pasts* to describe the same event. *Diverse Pasts* provides background on the relationship of the Iroquois, the Algonquin and the Sulpicians (albeit 150 pages prior to the unelaborated acknowledgement of Native-Sulpician conflict on a timeline):

> In the 1660s the Jesuits established a village for Iroquois Christians at Sault Saint-Louis, the present site of Kahnawake. The Mohawk claim that this region was always part of their traditional hunting territory. Figure 5.2 shows the first Iroquois arriving at this mission. In the same period, another Catholic order – the Sulpicians – started a mixed Iroquois and Algonquin village on the Island of Montréal near the town. This village was later moved away from Montréal to the other side of the island and was finally located at Oka – present-day Kanesatake – on lac des Deux-Montagnes. (p. 63)

It is worth noting that this is an important evasion of critical issues and discussion: the text acknowledges that the Mohawk claim that this was always their territory, but does not add anything in the form of explanation, elaboration or evaluation of this fact. *Seven*

Generations presents a historical discourse that emphasizes the explanation of territorial claims by relatively detailed accounts of the events surrounding disputed claims, including primary sources presented as evidence of the events said to have transpired.

Diverse Pasts does not provide similar discussions of how battles over land emerged, and instead suggests the legitimacy of European land claims through the Eurocentric language used and lack of critical discussion. The texts' employment of this Eurocentric discourse is illustrated in the following examples of territorial expansion, which are either not substantiated with explanation of the rationales of actors, or are described with little critical reflection:

> Until 1534, only the east coast of North America had been visited by Europeans. The interior was still the preserve of Native peoples. Jacques Cartier changed this by sailing hundreds of kilometres up the St. Lawrence River. His trips, illustrated in figure 3.5, dramatically increased European knowledge of the continent and established French claims to Canada. (p. 33)

> France did not, however, want to be left out of the race to claim the New World, and an effort was made to establish a permanent colony in America. (p. 35)

> To make sure that French claims to Canada were recognized by other European countries, François I felt that it was necessary to establish a permanent settlement. (p. 37)

In the first excerpt, the statement that Cartier's trips "established French claims to Canada" reflects the absence of a Native perspective in the interpretation of the historical information. Furthermore, the reference to the "race to claim the New World" in the second excerpt is a particularly striking example of a Eurocentric approach to colonial expansion, in which the predominant worldview espouses the notion of *terra nullius*, as though the New World was not already inhabited. If this was meant to alert readers to the problems of such a view, this meaning would be lost on students who do not already have a critical understanding of the issues, and it would be undermined by the matter-of-fact and straightforward discussion of establishing permanent colonies in New France. And while *Diverse Pasts* does acknowledge that the Native people

protested Cartier's planting of the cross, it does not account for how he responded to their protests. Instead, the conclusion of this encounter states that he kidnapped two Native boys and returned to France with them as captives (p. 33).

As noted above, there is virtually no discussion in *Diverse Pasts* of the legitimacy of French claims to North American lands and resources, and the granting of lands to French companies, and Jesuits as seigneuries is also not problematized. Further examples are also available:

> All the lands in New France had been given as a seigneury to the Company of One Hundred Associates in 1627, which granted parts of its holdings to individuals and religious institutions in the hope that they would bring out settlers (p. 77)
>
> The Sulpicians arrived in Montréal in 1657 and became seigneurs of the island in 1663 (p. 82)
>
> To help pay for the missions, the Company of One Hundred Associates gave the Jesuits huge seigneuries. Clerical control of land increased after 1663, and by the end of the French regime one-quarter of all the land was owned by the church, as you can see in figure 6.8 (p. 85)

Iroquois claims to the Ohio Valley are not represented in Figure 9.3, which shows British possessions in 1763 as including "Indian Territories" both north and south of the Ohio River (p. 122). Later in the discussion of settlement colonies, the text states that the Company of One Hundred Associates was "given a trade monopoly and title to French possessions in the St. Lawrence Valley and in Acadia, which covered Nova Scotia and New Brunswick" (p. 45). The "title to French possessions" that was granted seems to mean title to the land since the term "possessions" is used in other instances to refer to territory. That the land is said to have been "given" by the French government on the condition that the company would be involved in the religious conversion of the Natives (ibid.) is another example of how *Diverse Pasts* does a poor job of critically engaging students by problematizing European claims to territory and control of Native peoples. After having addressed the developments of French claims to Canada and the

establishment of Québec as the first permanent French settlement, *Diverse Pasts* then begins to introduce a discourse of French control of lands and resources as a natural and inevitable progression, again with no critical discussion. Below are some examples of the discourse that presumes the legitimacy of the French monarchy's jurisdiction in Canada:

> Although France gave monopolies to trading companies in the 1850s, none of these companies settled the land. (p. 44)

> Under Cardinal Richelieu, chief minister to the king of France, a new company, the Company of One Hundred Associates, was formed in 1627. It was given a trade monopoly and title to French possessions in the St. Lawrence Valley and in Acadia, which covered Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. In exchange, the company promised to settle 4000 colonists within fifteen years and to support missions to convert the Amerindians to Christianity. (p. 45)

A more explicit acknowledgement of French colonial policy is presented when the text states that "The French government believed that it was its duty to bring Christianity to the Native peoples of the colony" (p. 46) but there is no explicit discussion of why this would be problematic. This exemplifies the absence of Mohawk discourses on sovereignty in *Diverse Pasts*, in that Native societies are not recognized as distinct nations with their own religions. The nearest critical discussion at this point of the text is presented in the textbox on the Company of One Hundred Associates, outlining French colonial policy and asking students "How important were the Native peoples in the Crown's plans?" (p. 47). Given that this is an ambiguous question and that there is no discussion of the problems with French claims and policies on the management of territories and peoples in North America, it suggests a lack of Native perspectives of their communities' histories.

Representations of claims to power over lands and territories which are more reflective of Native perspectives appear in Figures 1.8 and 1.9 of *Diverse Pasts*, which provide a useful contrast between the lands and territories of Native groups before

contact and today. The caption under Figure 1.9 reads "compare the location of Native communities today and the areas they inhabited before the arrival of Europeans" (p. 12-13). If students compare the two figures they see the difference between specific settlements and vast areas of land.

As for the origins of Mohawks' claims to the territorial area in question, *Seven Generations* describes the Iroquois migrations from the mound societies and subsequent settlement of various areas of North America:

> **Each Iroquois Nation Settled In Its Own Territory** ... The Kanienkehaka, or the Flint People, traveled the furthest east and occupied the greatest territory. They settled on the northern most part of the St. Lawrence at Stadacona and Hochelaga and along the Mohawk River. The Oneidas, or the People of the Standing Stone, built their villages around Oneida Lake to the west of the Kanienkehaka (*p.* 49-50).

According to the text, Iroquois claims to the St. Lawrence Valley were an outcome of the First Algonquin War, when the Five Nations were victorious. The Algonquin tried to negotiate keeping the lakes in the disputed territory "open to all nations for trade and travel" but the Iroquois responded by "demand[ing] the right to control the water routes", to which the Algonquin were not in a powerful position to object. This resulted in the incorporation of the St. Lawrence Valley into the Five Nations territory (p. 96). While this demonstrates that the principle of 'might makes right' was as operative in Native political dealings as in those of Europeans, it does none the less make explicit the rationale and process by which the territory is said to have been acquired, which is not the case in *Diverse Pasts'* representations European territorial expansion.

However, one reference to Mohawk control of the waterways in *Seven Generations* which is more ambiguous is the statement about the French and English wars "for control of the seas" when the text states that "The Kanienkehaka had fought long and hard wars to guarantee that travel on the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence

River be kept open to all nations" (p. 202-3). What is not clear is how the Mohawk concept of 'control' of travel on the lakes and river could be equated to the very same principle of openness to all nations that was being denied to the Algonquin when the Mohawk claimed victory during the First Algonquin War. It may be that 'control' simply means having the right, *in principle*, to deny access under certain circumstances, but this is not clearly spelled out to students in the text. What is made clear, however, is that the French and English sought to ignore existing 'maritime and riverine rights of free passage' by seeking to control the seas (p. 203). This is one of the few instances when the Mohawk text presents the nations' claims vis-à-vis other Native nations in a discourse that does not fully discuss its claims as a dominant group, or the resistance it encountered from other nations. Most of the representations of the rights and agreements of diverse nations focus on Kanienkehaka dealings with Europeans.

Seven Generations provides numerous references to treaties, agreements, speeches, and letters to the Canadian government to support claims to the fact that lands had been "stolen" by colonists and that the sovereignty of the Mohawk Nation and of the Iroquois Confederacy were being ignored and denied unjustly.

> **The Kanienkehaka And Dutch Made The Two Row Wampum Treaty**. After this initial unfortunate contact between the Dutch and Kanienkehaka, the two nations came together and concluded a treaty of peace and friendship. This treaty became the basis far all dealings between the Confederacy and the nations of Europe. (p. 121)
>
> According to John Pyrlaeus, the Two Row Wampum Treaty was made in the year 1645 between the Kanienkehaka and the Dutch. The council for the treaty was held at Tawasentha, about four miles south of Albany. (p. 122)
>
> A peace treaty was made between the Kanienkehaka and French in 1645. (p. 155)
>
> **The Principles Of The Two Row Wampum Treaty Were Reaffirmed In The Covenant Chain.** When the English took over from the Dutch at Albany in 1664, the basic principles of the Two Row Wampum Treaty were reaffirmed through what is called the covenant chain. (p. 173-4)

> In 1768 the Confederacy made a treaty at Fort Stanwix with the British. This treaty guaranteed that Iroquois lands would not be invaded and that the sovereignty of the Confederacy would be respected. (p. 258)
>
> In 1756, Dr. John Mitchell completed a map which showed the exact territory of the Six Nations. According to treaty agreements, this territory was left intact... After the American War of Independence, a French artist by the name of Jean Lattre completed a map of the United States of America with the boundaries determined by the Treaty of Paris. (p. 271)
>
> On November 19, 1794 the Jay Treaty was finalized between the United States and Great Britain. The treaty stated that native people would be allowed free passage over the border, and would be able to transport goods without paying duties and taxes. The treaty honored the fact that the Mohawk Nation still existed despite the boundaries set by European and American governments. (p. 304)

The volume of text addressing Mohawk claims reveals the attention given to substantiating claims to sovereignty, nationhood and territory. Similarly, Chapter 22, "Plans to Assimilate Native People", provides a detailed account of letters and petitions sent to the Canadian Governor General in response to the Indian Act and the band council system of government. These detailed records span ten pages of the *Seven Generations* text, presenting correspondence between Mohawk communities and the Canadian government. Their efforts begin in 1888 with a letter explaining the problems of the band council system and the peoples' will to return to the traditional system of hereditary chiefs, and conclude in 1899 with a "revolt" against Indian Act elections in which one man died and several Mohawk hereditary chiefs were arrested (p. 363-373). These records include attempts made by elected chiefs, women, and clanmothers from the communities of Tyendinaga, Six Nations, Kahnawake, Kanesatake, and Akwesasne/St. Regis.

This leads to another important focus of the current analysis, which has been touched upon throughout this chapter but will be developed in more detail now. The issue is how both texts represent the resistance of Mohawk and Iroquois peoples to colonization, that is, resistance to colonial control of Native peoples through government

policy and law enforcement, and resistance to colonial control of lands and resources through resource extraction and development, and the establishment of settlements.

Representations of Resistance

Seven Generations makes it very clear that the Iroquois strictly oppose European claims to control over their people and their territory. This consistent message throughout the text is well summarized in the following passage:

> **The Iroquois Held The Following Position Regarding The French and English**. The Confederacy had the following position concerning its relationship with the French and English. This position did not change, despite what the English and the French claimed:
>
> 1. The Five Nations were a united people. They reserved for themselves the right to make agreements and to enter into alliances without restriction.
> 2. The nations of the Confederacy were not the subjects of either the King of England or the King of France.
> 3. The territory of the Confederacy was not to be claimed by either the King of France or the King of England. The land of the Confederacy could only be sold by the duly appointed representatives of the nations of the Confederacy.
> 4. Members of a nation belonging to the Confederacy could not join with either the French or the English in attacking another nation of the Confederacy. They could join with either the French or the English only when the conflict did not put one Iroquois against another.
> 5. When the covenant chain was renewed, the Iroquois people were to be treated as equals in all negotiations. The language of the agreements reflected this equality as did the terms of the agreements. (p. 176)

Seven Generations provides ample examples of Kanienkehaka grievances against the colonial governments:

> **The American Government Refused To Recognize The Confederacy**. In 1784 a treaty conference was held at Fort Stanwix. The Six Nations went to the treaty conference to negotiate with the American government and determine the new boundaries of land. When the American commissioners arrived, they refused to recognize the existence of the Confederacy. The very same government which had praised the wisdom of the Confederacy now denied that the Confederacy even existed. (p. 263)
>
> After the American War of Independence, therefore, the new American government had many documents to determine the boundaries of the Six Nations. They could rely on the maps of Evans, Mitchell, Lattre and the extensive collection captured by Amherst.
>
> The United States government had other things on its mind. It wanted native land. (p. 271)

> The Seven Indian Nations of Canada never had any authorization from the Confederacy to represent the Six Nations.
>
> In May of 1796, representatives from the Seven Indian Nations of Canada met with agents for the State of New York to negotiate a treaty concerning title to the Mohawk lands in New York ... On May 31, 1796, a treaty was signed between the Seven Indian Nations of Canada and the United States. In this treaty the Kanienkehaka ceded and released to the State of New York all lands except for the six square miles reserved for them by Macomb, a square mile on the Salmon River, a square mile on the Grass River where mills had been built, and the meadows on both sides of the Grass River. (p. 278-9)
>
> Much later, in the 1850's the Kanienkehaka entered a land claim in the Assembly of the State of Vermont. Vermont appointed a man by the name of Hodgkins to investigate the Mohawk claim. Hodgkins published a report in which he argued that the Kanienkehaka had a just and legal claim to lands in the State of Vermont. He suggested that the state settle the land claim in favor of the Kanienkehaka. (p. 282)
>
> **The Treaty of Ghent Ended The War** ... According to the treaty the United States and England restored to all native people the full rights and boundaries that they had occupied before the outbreak of hostilities. Therefore, the Jay Treaty which basically states that the border does not exist for the Kanienkehaka was once again in effect.
>
> Neither the British nor the Americans respected this part of the treaty. Fr. Marcoux reminded the British of their responsibilities to the Kanienkehaka in this regard. His advice and pleadings went unnoticed. (p. 311)
>
> **The Canadian Government's Actions Were A Violation Of The Two Row Wampum Treaty**. R.C.M.P. constables were stationed at Six Nations as agents of the Canadian government to force the people to accept the Indian Act and the Band Council form of government. The people persisted in refusing to deal with the Indian Act. They sent numerous petitions to the parliaments of England and Canada (p. 405-6)

Nothing close to this amount of explanation and legitimation is provided in *Diverse Pasts*. Prior to the final chapter, which provides the most comprehensive discussion of Native resistance to the colonization of lands and peoples in eastern Canada, there is only one reference which might be said to acknowledge, albeit indirectly, that the Iroquois had made claims to the lands:

> In 1763 the western First Nations, under the leadership of the Ottawa chief Pontiac, attacked British traders throughout the Great Lakes region ... During the war years the Amerindians had received few trade goods. They needed supplies but found the prices charged by the British traders too high and the quality of goods poor. And they were upset that the British did not follow the French practice of "gift diplomacy," the annual custom of giving presents to the Amerindians to renew the alliance. The Amerindians also were alarmed

> by land-hungry British Americans moving onto their lands, and their fears had been increased by the *British refusal to recognize Amerindian land claims in the St. Lawrence Valley*. Because of disunity, however, the alliance started to fall apart in 1764. *A peace treaty between the western Natives and the British was finally signed in 1766.* (p. 114, emphasis added)

The emphasized text might make reference to Iroquois claims, but it is difficult to know whether other Native peoples in the region were also advancing claims against the British. In fact, a previous paragraph on the same page of *Diverse Pasts* states that "Although the French had asked the British to protect their Amerindian allies and allow them to continue living on their lands and have missionaries, the British refused" (p. 114). Therefore, these may have been the Native peoples in question. A generous interpretation could still suggest that at least some effort is made here to represent Iroquois claims.

There are other important implications of the passage above. First, while it is desirable that it includes representations of Native perspectives, concerns, etc. the absence of information about those of Iroquois and other First Nations in Quebec is striking. Second, the switch from "western First Nations" to "Amerindians" makes it unclear exactly which nations are being discussed, which is part of the problem of homogenizing representations of Native people. And while the reference to Pontiac is one example of a specific native person from a specific nation juxtaposed against a general reference to "British traders" and "settlers", this is still the only instance other than discussion of Joseph Brant. Finally, why is there no similar discussion about a "peace treaty" being signed between the Iroquois and the French in 1701 at Montreal, with equal amount of context and Native historical perspective?

As mentioned, the discussion of Joseph Brant's role in the establishment of contemporary Mohawk reserves is one of the only instances when *Diverse Pasts* depicts the Iroquois as active players in a relationship of equality to the British. The textbox entitled "Thayendanega" explains:

> Much of the Iroquois Confederacy fought on the British side in the war against the French and in the American Revolution. Many Iroquois came to Canada as loyalists ... After the revolution, Iroquois leaders were enraged when Great Britain ignored its Amerindian allies and transferred their lands as far as Mississippi to the Americans. As compensation, the British granted the Iroquois a large tract of land along the Grand River, which became known as the Six Nations Reserve. (p. 126)

While this is a positive inclusion of the Iroquois as political players (not only aggressive threats to settlement), there remains a contradictory representation of Iroquois claims in that the lands in question are identified as belonging to the Iroquois as "their lands", but the supremacy of British rule is reinforced when it states that Britain "granted" them a tract of land. From the perspective of the Mohawk and Iroquois, the land never ceased to be theirs. Furthermore, the text presents an image of Joseph Brant that is very different from *Seven Generations*, as we have seen. According to Mohawk historical perspectives, Brant was not to be counted among the leaders resisting British territorial expansion, but as an accomplice in the loss of lands to the British.

The absence of a discourse of Iroquois sovereignty and territorial claims in *Diverse Pasts* could be interpreted as an attempt at objectivity and impartiality. However, this would not justify the omission of critical issues for many critics who would charge that education perpetuates dominant institutions and social relations by not calling them into question. Furthermore, this argument is undermined by the inclusion of references to the resistance of other social groups on numerous occasions:

> The impact of the Conquest on French Canada has been a subject of heated debate. Generations of English Canadians were brought up to believe that, in the words of nineteenth-century historian Francis Parkman, "a happier calamity never befell a people than the Conquest of Canada by British arms." French Canadians had a different outlook. They saw the French régime as a golden age and the period after Conquest as a long struggle for survival. (p. 115)

> In 1927 the British courts awarded all of Labrador to Newfoundland. Québec did not recognize this decision and still claims all of Labrador, except for a small strip along the Labrador Sea. (p. 139)

Other examples of different groups' rationales and ideologies regarding debated issues and events are addressed above. This leads us back to the conclusion that Mohawk and Iroquois perspectives of history are consistently omitted from representations of their roles and from representations of struggles over national sovereignty and territorial control in Quebec and Canada. There should be room in the discussion for debates and struggles between the Iroquois Confederacy and the Canadian government, and for representations of how young Iroquois, or Native peoples more generally, are raised to understand the history of these debates – as is the case for the text's treatment of English-French tensions in Quebec.

From Chapter 12 through to Chapter 25 of the *Diverse Pasts* text, the discourses on national sovereignty, territorial claims and resistance to British rule are reserved exclusively to French Canadian nationalist movements. At this point there also emerges a series of references to "ethnic struggles". One would think this would provide information about the variety of ethnic groups seeking recognition of rights or improvements in their social standing, including Native peoples and immigrant populations. One of the only such statements is that "Since Confederation, many Canadians have worried about their culture and distinction as a people" (p. 231), referring to the English majority fearful of American and immigrant cultural influences, and the struggles of Native peoples. It goes on to state that the westward expansion of Canada by 1885 was "strongly resisted by the Métis and the Native peoples," (p. 231) but this chapter does not include Quebec native peoples' reactions to Confederation and the Indian Act, and does not include western Natives in its discussion of ethnic conflict.

In fact the discourse of ethnicity is largely reserved to discussions of the struggles between French and English in Quebec and Canada. Even where the Métis rebellion led by Louis Riel is framed as an "ethnic" struggle, it is presented first and foremost as a revolt of the French against English rule:

> Historians do not agree on the reasons for the Northwest Rebellion or on Louis Riel's role in this rebellion. George Stanley saw the issue as part of the Canadian ethnic question:
>
> > The basic problem of Canadian history has been that of accommodating, within the confines of a single country, two nations, one speaking French and the other speaking English. The role of Riel was essentially that of a symbol, the symbol of French Canada's will to survive (p. 230)

The centrality of conflicts between French and English peoples to Quebec history is not being disputed, but it seems that there is greater potential for representations of Mohawk and other Native peoples' mobilization for national recognition. In *Seven Generations*, numerous letters and speeches to British colonial authorities are included to illustrate the efforts that were made by the Kanienkehaka to have the Canadian and American governments recognize their sovereign status as nations.

Representations of the Métis are relatively extensive in *Diverse Pasts*, which does a service to elevating the profile of Native claims to lands, for example with statements about "land owned by Native peoples" and descriptions of acts of resistance (p. 226-27). These representations also acknowledge problems with the violation of treaty agreements, stating that "the Native peoples' complaints to Ottawa about these disruptions were ignored" and that "those tribes that had signed treaties (see figure 15.10) complained that some of the treaties had not been respected" (p. 228). However, they remain problematic in that the discourses frame the Métis struggle as a French-English ethnic conflict, and that this level of discussion is not included about similar disputes over territories and nationhood within the province Québec.

Mohawk Nationalism & Québec Sovereignty

After the review of Confederation in *Diverse Pasts*, a discourse on sovereignty and nationalism begins to emerge as "ethnic struggles" between the French and English in Canada gain more historical prominence. English Canadian nationalism is presented primarily in terms of resistance to the influence of open immigration policies (p. 260-61),

while French Canadian nationalism is presented primarily in terms of political action against the English-dominated Canadian government's constraints on the civil rights and socio-economic status of French Canadians. The following quote from Jules-Paul Tardivel, cited in the text, illustrates the most prominent concerns addressed in *Diverse Pasts*:

> Our highest interests are not centred at Ottawa; for us, who are French Canadian and Catholic, they are centred at Québec, where we make our own laws on education, civil rights, property, municipal institutions, the administration of justice, and charitable institutions, etc. – in fact, all those things which make up the intimate and real life of a nation. (p. 267)

This type of discourse on French Canadian nationalism in Quebec is very similar to that of the Kanienkehaka in Seven Generations. Yet, there is no acknowledgement of the shared experiences of the French under British rule and the Mohawk and other Native peoples under Euro-Canadian rule. The negative impacts of Confederation on Native peoples are suggested in *Diverse Pasts*, but it is not directly addressed either in terms of the restrictions imposed on Native people through the Indian Act or the underlying issue of Mohawk nationhood:

> Confederation did not recognize the existence of the French and the English as the two founding peoples of Canada, nor was any mention made of nations. Native peoples were placed under the supervision and control of the federal government. (p. 223)

Although more could be said to educate readers about Native peoples' claims to nationhood and sovereignty and the implications of federal Indian policy, it is positive that they are included in this discussion of the impacts of Confederation on the two other major groups in Canada, the French and English. And while *Diverse Pasts* does present a sympathetic portrayal of Mohawk claims during the conflict at Oka, it does not present a discourse on Mohawk sovereignty that corresponds with those discourses presented throughout *Seven Generations.* For example, *Diverse Pasts* states that:

> Most Québecers failed to grasp that Native peoples had legitimate grievances. Québec nationalists went so far as to interpret the events as a

> plot to further attack Québec after the humiliation of Meech Lake. The Canadian government used military force and branded the Warriors as common criminals to try to force them to surrender. (p. 397).

Although the specific phrase "Native demands for self-government" is used on three occasions in this chapter, no explanation is provided and the term *sovereignty* is only used to refer to the struggle of French Canadians in the Québec nationalist cause, as illustrated in the excerpt below:

> Québec politics centred on questions of collective as opposed to individual rights, language laws, and sovereignty, which were highlighted by the adopton [sic] of the Canadian and Québec Charters of Rights in the 1980s. In the 1990s, Québec faced new challenges in such areas as constitutional reform, women's rights, environmental concerns, and Native demands for self-government, while being increasingly affected by the globalization of trade and culture. (p. 399)

Whereas Native activism and nationalism receive very little treatment in the text, the treatment of political developments in Quebec are discussed at length, with representations which bear a striking resemblance to the Mohawk discourses on sovereignty presented in *Seven Generations,* as noted above. There is only one instance when the similarities between Mohawk - or Native – and Québec nationalism are acknowledged in the text, which comes earlier in the same chapter on "Contemporary Québec". It is an excerpt of a speech by former prime minister Pierre Elliott Trudeau:

> I repeat, there is nothing wrong with the notion of collective rights *per se,* there is nothing wrong with the notion of nation in a sociological sense: the Six Nations or the French-Canadian nation or the Icelandic nation. But if we go from there to say that each nation must have a recognized territory over which it will exercise a measure of sovereignty, we are changing not only the basic philosophy of the Charter but also the basic philosophy of what sovereignty means in Canada. (p. 388)

While there are numerous references in the text to Québec nationalism, there is no discussion anywhere, including before or after this excerpt of Trudeau's speech, when *Diverse Pasts* acknowledges the common traits of French Canadian and Native nationalism and reasons for resistance to the Anglo-dominant Canadian government.

Diverse Pasts does represent the fact that Native peoples have presented claims to land and assertions of their rights to a distinct society, as in the following examples:

> Relations with Native peoples are a recurring challenge in Québec. Increased pride in their heritage and traditions has placed new emphasis on the distinctiveness of Native societies. With many Native languages on the verge of extinction, initiatives such as the Kahnawake Survival School (established in 1977) have sought to reverse this trend. (p. 396)

> Fundamental to the [Oka] crisis was the fact that Natives in southern Québec never ceded their territory to the government by treaty, and government [sic] paid little attention to their demands ... Although the federal government promised to buy lands claimed by the Mohawk to prevent the golf course construction, no real solution was found to the issue of Native land claims. Oka was not the only region affected by disputes over territory in the 1990s. (p. 396-98)[22]

Although there is reference to "demands for self-government" in Chapter 26 of *Diverse Pasts*, these demands are never explicitly explained and instead the only references to Native demands are related to political protection of Native rights (p. 388) and recognition of land claims (p. 396-98). The discussion which most directly addresses issues of self-government or sovereignty is presented twenty pages earlier in Chapter 24, but the representation suggests that most Native people are not fighting for recognition of sovereignty or self-government:

> Native peoples have been more insistent about their rights since 1970. Some Native leaders believe that their peoples should abandon their traditions and join mainstream Canadian life. Others advocate total separation of Native and non-Native society. This would include complete control over their lands and no interference from government. Most Native leaders do not call for the cutting of all ties with the rest of Canadian society. Instead, they want to maintain their values and traditions within the framework of Canada. At the same time, Native peoples want greater control over their destiny. In areas where no treaties have been signed, Native groups claim title to the land and want to benefit from its development. (p. 371-72)

This representation is significantly different from those presented in *Seven Generations* which emphasize Mohawk rejection of Canadian and American citizenship and steadfast assertion of sovereignty, although *Seven Generations* focuses on the past rather than the

[22] Unfortunately, *Seven Generations* does not include content on the Oka Crisis for comparison.

present time discussed in *Diverse Pasts*. Below are some examples of the Mohawk discourses on citizenship:

> The British told the Kanienkehaka at Kahnawake and Akwesasne that they would be needed to fight the Americans in the area of Niagara Falls. The Kanienkehaka refused. This refusal earned them the anger of the governor of Upper and Lower Canada, Sir George Prevost. Prevost was new to dealing with the Kanienkehaka. He had not yet learned that the Kanienkehaka did not consider themselves as Canadian citizens. The Kanienkehaka told Prevost that they would defend their own lands, but not under the command of Canadian or British officers. (p. 304)

> The Bagot Commission recommendations were put into a series of laws developed between 1850 and 1867. In some respects these laws were meant to protect native people. On the other hand, they encouraged native people to become a part of Canadian society as quickly possible. These laws outlined ways in which Canada could transform native people into Canadian citizens. None of these laws were made with the permission of or input of native people. They were made by the British in Canada as solutions to what they viewed as the Indian problem. What was the Indian problem? The very fact that there were native people with native land was viewed as a problem to the British. (p. 361)

> The Kanienkehaka had ignored the Indian Act for years. They kept sending petitions to Ottawa demanding that it be recalled. However, the Canadian government still thought that the Kanienkehaka wanted to become Canadian citizens. (p. 381)

> The next step was to force American citizenship onto the people of Akwesasne. The United States government ignored the fact that Akwesasne was trying to keep alive the traditions of the Kanienkehaka and the Great Law of Peace. (p. 399)

> The Grand Council knew that the United States and Canada would try to draft Iroquois men into the armed forces. The Council did not want the governments of the United States and Canada to argue that Iroquois men in the armed forces were citizens of the United States or Canada. To prevent this type of reasoning, the Grand Council had made its own declaration of war. It passed a resolution stating that it was permissible for the warriors of the Six Nations to serve with the armies of the United States and Canada. (p. 432)

These statements reflect a discourse on citizenship as something that has been imposed by the Canadian and American governments, but never accepted by the Mohawk or Iroquois people. It is not clear whether this position would still be maintained in a new textbook produced today by and for the Mohawk people. However, it is very important to note the striking difference between *Seven Generations*' and *Diverse Pasts*' representations of the

relationship of the Mohawk and other Native peoples to Canadian society. The former emphasizes a critical discourse on Mohawk sovereignty and the conditions of a nation-to-nation relationship between the Mohawk and Canada. The latter tends to omit analytical discussion of the incorporation of Native peoples into Canadian society and only briefly references Native peoples' claims without couching them in critical discussion or contextualization of the issues, as has been shown in the discussions of explanations of territorial control and jurisdiction over Native peoples since Confederation.

Native Peoples As Historical Figures & Political Subjects

With the exceptions of Joseph Brant and Louis Riel, there are no examples of specific Native people juxtaposed against general references to Europeans in *Diverse Pasts*. If we consider this as an issue of abstraction, as identified in the CDA approach to discourse analysis, there is a strong indication that this discursive form reflects a power imbalance in that European nations have specific, individual heroes and historical figures at the focal point of the historical account, whereas Native nations are not even identified at the level of their particular nation, let alone at the level of individual historical figures. Importantly, neither Louis Riel nor Joseph Brant was a key player in European-Native relations in Quebec.

This tendency to generalize and homogenize Native peoples is not apparent in *Seven Generations*, where clear distinctions are made between the nations of the Confederacy and specific individuals are frequently identified as key historical actors, whether of European or indigenous descent, including references to the speeches of Iroquois chiefs, the journals of European explorers, and relations with colonists and Jesuits, etc. Examples of these have been included throughout this work, including examples of *Seven Generations*' tendency to identify Native individuals and groups by their nation. Of particular significance in the current comparison of the two history texts

is the tendency of *Diverse Pasts* to refer consistently to "the Iroquois" whereas *Seven Generations* refers to specific nations and often explains their respective positions and roles in the Confederacy's dealings with the European nations and colonists. For example:

> The Seneca, Cayuga, Onondaga and Oneida had been more eager to establish a peace with the French than had the Kanienkehaka. It was easier for these four western nations to deal with the French at Montreal than with the Dutch or English at Albany. The four western nations were at this time fighting the Susquehannock Nation, south of the territory of the Five Nations. They could not afford to fight a two front war, one with the Susquehannock and one with the French. (p. 152)

This is only one example that illustrates the way in which *Seven Generations* represents the diversity of the Iroquois nations and of their political interests and relationships to European nations.

In *Diverse Pasts*, other examples can be highlighted to illustrate the imbalance in the language used to describe European and Native individuals and groups, suggesting the tendency to give a higher profile to European historical actors than Native people, who tend to remain at the level of homogeneous groups. Among these examples are the following:

> Men such as Pierre Gaultier, sieur de La Vérendrye, and his sons pushed the fur frontier across the prairies and integrated scores of Natives into the French alliance (p. 51)

> Native peoples adopted European guns and metal tools, while the French quickly realized the advantages of Native canoes and snowshoes (p. 56)

In the first excerpt, there is one European man and his sons juxtaposed against "scores of Natives," while in the second excerpt, in addition to coupling Native peoples (general) and the French (specific), the difference between "adopting" and "quickly realizing the advantages of" another culture's objects is also problematic and symptomatic of unequal forms of representation. It is reasonable to assume that Native peoples also quickly realized the advantages of guns and metals tools, rather than having just adopted them for no apparent reason.

Like the first excerpt above, another example of individual European men coupled with generic "Native peoples" is the description of Jesuit Jacques Marquette, who is again the main historical actor, and who becomes exposed to the unspecified Natives "around Lake Superior" (p. 50). All that is said in reference to Native people is that Marquette "quickly mastered several Native languages ... His knowledge of the people and their language enabled him to gather information about the region" (p. 50-51). This description begs the questions: Which people? Which language? Meanwhile, the text goes into enough detail about Marquette to describe the circumstances surrounding his death (p. 51).

Diverse Pasts' historical account of European expansion into the territories of Native peoples, while not entirely negative or exclusionary in its representations, is still clearly Eurocentric in its framing of the narrative being told. Native nations tend to be generalized and cast as the Other, them instead of us, they instead of we or he or she – references are to general groups instead of individuals. The following statement provides an example:

> From 1608 to 1627 Champlain established a trading system in the St. Lawrence Valley ... By fighting with [the Algonquin and the Huron] against the Iroquois ... Champlain ensured that the alliance would be strong (p. 44).

Champlain is the main protagonist who establishes the trading system and fights with the Natives to ensure a strong alliance. But given that both the Huron and the Iroquois are confederacies of nations, what about their leaders and key protagonists?

In Chapter 4 of *Diverse Pasts*, Native peoples are portrayed as having participated in the fur trade but not as having control of lands except as helpers to the French.

> [The Hudson River] port was dominated by the Dutch until 1664, when Britain captured the colony and renamed it New York. The nations of the Iroquois League, and especially the Mohawk, were the major trading partners. The St. Lawrence River penetrated the deepest into the continent and gave access to furs from both the Great Lakes region and the Canadian

> Shield. New France controlled this route with the help of Algonquin and Huron allies (p. 44)
>
> During the 1660s and 1670s, the Great Lakes and Hudson Bay were integrated into the French trading network. (p. 50)

The first excerpt evokes the question, why have the only mention of the Iroquois for tens of pages prior to this represented them only as a hostile force toward colonists, when now they are presented as major partners in the fur trade? And why are the Algonquian nations presented as "helpers" to the French instead of partners like the Iroquois? In the second statement, why is it a *French* trading network and not the Iroquois or Algonquian trade network if they were key players as suppliers and traders?

There is a significant ambiguity in *Diverse Pasts'* portrayals of the Iroquois, which start out as somewhat misinformed in the overview of Iroquois culture and society, then become extremely negative by only representing them as a hostile threat to colonists without explaining their motives for armed conflict, then ignores their existence for several chapters, then finally advocates quite strongly for the legitimacy of their claims in recent years, including the Oka Crisis. In this way, the best assessment of the representations of the Iroquois in *Diverse Pasts* is that they are contradictory and incomplete.

Explanation, Evaluation & Critical Discussion

Although it would be inappropriate to try to determine whether *Seven Generations* is historically accurate in its interpretation, one could argue that by providing explicit and overt interpretations of events and the reasons for them it is a more transparent text. *Diverse Pasts*, on the other hand, tends toward vague assertions and missing information about the contexts and motives of historical actors, as has been discussed above. This could be problematic from a pedagogical perspective in that students are

left to arrive at their own conclusions and judgements about the actions and characters of various groups (although teachers would play an important role in interpreting the textbook content with students). The following section elaborates an analysis of how the texts address the issue of injustices toward Native peoples.

In *Seven Generations*, the issue of Columbus' encounter with the Caribs and kidnapping in spite of their hospitality is described as "duplicitous" and characteristic of subsequent dealings of Europeans with Natives. But the text does not suggest that Europeans are inherently bad, but asks "Why the Europeans behaved in the manner that they did?" (p. 109). The answer is that European societies in the 15th and 16th centuries were full of violence, based on the rule that might makes right, and filled with gender and class inequality. The text then goes on to juxtapose acts of Native generosity met with European aggression. "The reason for this European treachery was that the Europeans mistook kindness for weakness... interpreted gift giving as an act of submission and regarded anything that was not violent as primitive" (p. 110).

Unlike *Seven Generations,* the only aspect of this series of injustices that is accompanied with an explanatory discussion is Cartier's claim to land, for which it is stated that "Cartier, like other Europeans of his time, did not believe nomadic peoples had any claim to land" (*Diverse Pasts*, 33). The text goes on to read that "in any event, it was his duty as a Christian to bring them under the control of a Christian king so that they could be converted" (ibid.). While this succeeds in conveying the logic of Europeans at the time, it presents the logic as a matter of fact without problematizing it. The statement seems deserving of critical reflection and discussion by students and their teacher, but there is no encouragement in the text for such analysis. The fact that such analysis is absent leaves students oblivious to the ironic tone of the statement, or to the magnitude of the negative impact of this forced conversion. Even the language used in the statement, beginning with the phrase "in any event" makes the aggressive nature of

colonialism seem inconsequential and/or inevitable. This discursive representation fails at critically engaging students in the processes of history, which is by far more effectively achieved in the *Seven Generations* text.

Another example is that of the charter of the Company of One Hundred Associates:

> The King has the same desire as his father, Henri IV, of glorious memory, to find and discover in the lands of New France, also called Canada, a site to establish a colony in order to bring the natives to know the one true God and to govern them and instruct them in the Roman Catholic faith. The only means to achieve this end is to settle the land with Catholic subjects who, through their example, can teach these peoples to be good Christians and to live according to our civil laws. This will also establish our authority and help our subjects to carry out some useful trade ... (p. 47)

Based on the patterns of discourse observed in the analysis, it is very likely that *Seven Generations* would have used this excerpt as an occasion to reaffirm the principles of sovereignty or to reintroduce the concept of worldview as a key factor in the treatment of Native peoples by Europeans. However, *Diverse Pasts* only addresses the problem of setting out to govern and convert another nation's people by asking the somewhat benign question "How important were the Native peoples in the Crown's plans?" (p. 47). The question of how important they were is ambiguous because on one hand, they were very important in that they figured prominently in French colonial plans, but they were unimportant in that no concern was demonstrated for their existing rights as sovereign nations, free to determine their own religious and governance systems. Even if one wants to present a generous interpretation of the motives of colonial powers who sought to convert Native peoples, a balanced representation that includes Native peoples' perspectives would include critical discussion of how these plans were received by Native peoples, perhaps making reference to the varied reception that Christianity had among different nations, and definitely addressing the issue of settling Native territories with colonies.

Diverse Pasts not only excludes Mohawk and other Native peoples perspectives of history, it also presents misleading content that risks teaching students a misinformed understanding of historical impacts on Native people. One of the review questions for the first unit of *Diverse Pasts* asks students the following:

> How were the lives of Native peoples affected by the Europeans? Choose one of the following:
> a) There was greater unity between the different Native tribes.
> b) The Natives became dependent on some European goods.
> c) Native traditions were preserved and continued to develop.
> d) The Natives adopted a sedentary way of life. (p. 56)

The instruction to "choose on of the following" suggests that there is a single answer that is correct. However, regardless of which answer the students should be directed to by the contents of the text, each of the four possible answers is an actual impact of colonization on Indigenous peoples. Of course each of them has its complexities and caveats, but all of them are documented effects of the arrival of Europeans of which a historian of North America should be aware. Therefore, forcing students to choose one forces them to learn misinformation about the impacts of colonialism.

The term "colonialism" is not used in *Diverse Pasts*. Instead, "colonization" is used to refer to the process by which North America was settled and populated by Europeans and other immigrants. More specifically, the text discusses the issue of colonization in terms of the movement of populations through immigration and emigration, and internally between rural and urban settings (p. 238-9). References are also made to Canada as a "colonization society" (p. 251). This benign representation of the concept is not coupled with any critical discussion, and therefore does not reflect the negative connotations of colonization that would likely be reflected in Native perspective of history. Some references to colonization and colonists in *Seven Generations* are relatively neutral, in that they do not explicitly critique the colonial process or Europeans:

> The Great Law of Peace was the rule of the land, until it was disturbed by the arrival of European colonists and the outbreak of the Second Algonquin War. (p. 98)
>
> What was it that prompted men such as Christopher Columbus to leave their homes and sail west to launch an age of discovery and colonization? (p. 107)
>
> Columbus was soon followed by wave upon wave of further explorers and colonists. The explorations of the French, English and Dutch are of the most interest and importance to the history of the Kanienkehaka. (p. 110)
>
> These thirteen colonies were always disunited. Canassatego, the Seneca Chief, had advised the colonists to form a union amongst themselves ... The colonists tried to do this at the Albany Congress ... After 1768 the colonists began to unite for a war against England, their former mothercountry [sic]. The colonists knew that they would benefit greatly if they had the support of the Confederacy ... At the beginning of their speech, the colonists referred to the words spoken by Canassatego at the Treaty of Lancaster some years before (p. 258)

However, as we have seen, *Seven Generations* does provide extensive discussion of the malignant aspects of European colonization of North America. The assessment that the statements above are 'relatively neutral' is best understood by contrast to some other of *Seven Generations*' representations of colonists that are far more negative and critical, although in the first example the text does suggest the importance of worldview in the harmful attitudes of Europeans, thereby placing the blame on the culture rather than the individuals:

> The attitude of early European colonists towards native people is summarized by the following thoughts:
>
> > Although the Lord has given the earth to the children of men, the greater part of it is possessed and wrongfully usurped by wild beasts and ignorant savages, who by reason of their godless ignorance and blasphemous idolatries are no better than the beasts. Indians are animals. Animals do not own land. Therefore we, God's chosen people, must conquer the earth and subdue it, as the Bible directs, even if that particular piece of land happens to be inhabited by animals in human form (Indians).
>
> These were strong words based on an ignorance of native world view. Native people were not godless. They simply believed that the Creator wanted them to keep the earth, his gift to man, beautiful and free of the factories and pollution, congested cities and waste that have characterized European society for centuries. (p. 16)
>
> When English colonists settled in the Connecticut River Valley of Massachusetts, they put a price on the scalps of Mohawk men, women and children ... For the capture of a Mohawk adult or child the Massachusetts' legislature paid twenty four pounds. These captives were sold into slavery to work in the sugar fields of the Carribean [sic]. (p. 182)

> There were thirteen original English colonies in North America at this time. The non-native people living in these colonies were known as colonists. The colonists did not agree with the treaty at Fort Stanwix. They wanted to expand into Iroquois land. (p. 258)
>
> **The Confederacy Did Not Want To Join The White Man's Quarrel.** The Iroquois response to this and other requests for help from both the colonists and the British were similar:
>
> > White men are now fighting over the land they robbed us of; why take sides with them in their quarrels? When we red men went to war, no white men came to help us. They let our nations destroy each other, and when our lands were soaked with our blood they came and occupied them. Let the white men alone; let them destroy each other; when they are gone, the forests and mountains and lakes and rivers, which belonged to our forefathers, will return to us. (p. 259)

The racism and cultural superiority that characterized Europeans' ideological rationale for colonization and domination of Native Americans was also extended to Africans. As we have seen above, Native Americans were also subject to the threat of captivity and enslavement at the hands of Europeans. Therefore a critical discussion of colonization or colonialism would need to include a discussion of how the peoples of both continents were impacted by European imperialism. Below is an example of how the issue of slavery is treated, like the subject of Native American domination at some points in *Diverse Pasts*, as somewhat inconsequential or integral to the normal evolution of European progress:

> The thirteen British colonies had a much larger population (see table 8.1) and a more varied economy, and they produced considerable wealth for Britain. The New England colonies specialized in fishing, the slave trade, shipbuilding, and the carrying trade; the middle colonies (New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware) produced large agricultural surpluses; the southern colonies grew tobacco and cotton for the British market. (p. 107)

Why is there no critical discussion of the slave trade, or at least acknowledgement that this is an important issue and it will be discussed later in the text? It is included as though the trade in human beings was just an economic activity like fishing, building ships, and transporting goods. To its credit, *Diverse Pasts* does revisit the issue of slavery in British North America fifty pages later in a prominent textbox, which lends

even more support to the recommendation that a statement be made when it is first mentioned to the effect that slavery is a very important issue in the history of colonization, and that it will be revisited further on.

Discussion

In keeping with the theoretical approaches of Fairclough (2003) and Smith (1999), texts and discourses play an important role in perpetuating and legitimating relations of dominance. This occurred in a variety of ways in the two texts, including the omission of representations of Iroquois peoples' claims and resistance in the provincial text, the normalization of French, English and Canadian claims to control over Native peoples and lands, and differences between the two texts' representations of Joseph Brant and the transfer of lands. Fairclough argues that "some ways of making meaning are dominant or mainstream in a particular order of discourse, others are marginal, or oppositional, or 'alternative'" (2003: 206). If we take these texts as elements of social events which constitute what is actual in society, as Fairclough does, then discourses about history are inseparable from discourses about contemporary life. The comparison of the two texts illustrates how Mohawk historical discourses could be characterized as taking an oppositional position to contemporary discourses. Mohawk discourses that the Iroquois Confederacy and the Great Law of Peace govern affairs in Kanienkeh, and that the Covenant Chain governs relations with European nations run contrary to popular discourses about Native relations with other groups within Canadian society. Discourses about Mohawk sovereignty and control of territory as a nation within the Iroquois Confederacy are overpowered by the dominant order of discourse which states that the Canadian government exercises control over lands and resources, and the affairs of Native peoples.

The analysis of the texts illustrates the manner in which students learn about their national identities, cultures and citizenship through educational discourses, as argued by Vincent and Arcand (1979) and Hall (1996a). Within *Diverse Pasts*, uncritical representations of Native peoples and territories being subsumed within Canadian law and jurisdiction contributes to Quebecois students' understanding of the legitimacy of the state and of control over Native people. Those students who identify with the French, English or immigrant groups depicted in the text will likely also identify with those groups' relationships to Native peoples. *Seven Generations* fosters the national consciousness of Mohawk students, both of themselves and of other groups, while *Diverse Pasts* suggests that Native peoples have been subsumed within Quebec society while remaining distinct. The representations of Native peoples as existing both within and beside the mainstream of Quebecois and Canadian society is another feature of the ambiguity that characterizes western histories of Native peoples analogous to the views of Francis (1992) and Trigger (1986).

Summary of Key Findings

The analysis has shown that the Mohawk discourses presented in *Seven Generations* affirm, explain and argue the legitimacy of Mohawk claims to sovereignty and territory. The discourses presented in *Diverse Pasts,* on the other hand, are ambivalent in their representations of Mohawk claims to sovereignty and territory, and generally omit critical discussion about issues related to colonization. While this ambivalence is at times akin to that of the alternately glorifying-vilifying discourses identified by Bruce Trigger (1985), the discourses in *Diverse Pasts* also reveal a dichotomy between the Iroquois and other Native groups as distinct, autonomous and diverse nations, and as a homogeneous group with tenuous claims to self-determination and dismissible claims to territory.

Similarly, the text reflects ambivalence about the importance of Native peoples' historical roles in that they are represented as central figures in the early history of North America, but then they become increasingly absent from the discussion with the development of French and English social and political institutions. Finally, they regain a prominent place in the history of Quebec and Canada from the 1970s on. This is also consistent with Daniel Francis' (1992) discussion of the ambiguous and variable place of Native peoples in Canadian historiography, and speaks to the concerns of the American Indian Historical Society when they ask in their first criteria for textbook evaluation, "Is the history of the American Indian presented as an integral part of the history of America, at every point of the nation's development?" (1970: 14). It also points to the continued Eurocentrism of the historical account taught to Quebec youth, where the history of nation-building is reserved to the French and English.

Diverse Pasts tends to privilege the struggles and concerns of French and English Canadians in its discourses on sovereignty and nationhood, but provides only a partial and de-contextualized representation of Native claims to nationhood, territory and sovereignty. As a result, the provincial textbook content continues, as has been found in other provinces and decades of research on the subject, to exclude Iroquois and other Native peoples' historical perspectives from its major narratives and critical discussion of these three discursive areas of analysis.

Within Fairclough's framework, the dimensions of *abstraction* and *additions* proved to be most insightful for identifying differences between the texts. *Diverse Pasts* does not portray the interaction between European and Native groups in very concrete terms, tending toward a more abstract depiction. The particulars of who, what, where, when and why in conflicts and encounters between groups are either omitted or presented in very general terms when they involve Native peoples; more details are sometimes provided for instances involving the French, British, Americans, etc. This

was particularly evident in representations of the political and territorial changes that occurred during the era of French and British colonization. *Seven Generations* tended to provide much more concrete information and contextualization of specific events. This difference included significant disparities in the two texts' use of primary sources, both as evidence and as material for students to engage in their own process of historical interpretation. Both texts invited students to engage with some primary sources, but *Seven Generations* supplemented original materials with a great deal of interpretation, whereas *Diverse Pasts* presented little primary material but included questions for engaging in analysis, though often not politicized analysis directed at understanding power relations and conflicts between groups.

Diverse Pasts reveals a strong tendency to de-contextualize and de-politicize descriptions of the role of the Iroquois in the history of Quebec and Canada. De-contextualization occurs through the omission of discussion of the rationale and arguments of Mohawk and Iroquois peoples' engagement in conflicts with other groups and claims to self-government. De-politicization occurs at one level through the apolitical representation of features of Iroquois society, such as the Longhouse and wampum, and at another level when references are made to Iroquois and other Native groups' resistance to various actions of European and Canadian governments without representing these conflicts as struggles for authority and control over lands and peoples, which are fundamentally political struggles.

This last point is integrally connected to the problem of contextualization. The structure and discourse of *Seven Generations* stand in stark contrast by presenting a much more politicized account of the history of the Mohawk nation with respect to nationhood, sovereignty and territory. And a great deal of attention seems to have been given to contextualizing the progression of events by outlining key principles of Iroquois worldview and political thought and supporting subsequent claims with detailed

explanations and evidence. The relative validity or weight of those claims and evidence are not being evaluated here; the point is only to stress the fact that they are included and this constitutes a fundamental difference between the two texts' discursive structures.

CHAPTER 6 – Conclusion: Implications for Education, Research & Policy

The analysis has revealed a number of important differences in the historical discourses on nationhood, territory and sovereignty presented in *Seven Generations* and *Diverse Pasts*. This research contributes to new understandings in a number of areas with implications for theory, method, pedagogy and policy.

An important consideration in interpreting the results of this research and considering the implications for future curriculum planning is that the history program for HIST-414 is currently under review, with a new program being designed for implementation in 2007.[23] That said, there remains a great deal to be learned from the current research. The knowledge gained about how provincial programs and textbooks differ from Mohawk representations of their communities and of the history of Quebec and Canada provides an important basis for further integration and inclusion of Native and Iroquois perspectives in the revised program.

Lessons & Implications for Textbook Content

A number of areas for change in the provincial textbook content have been suggested by the analysis if one accepts the need for further inclusion of Native perspectives. Increased contextualization and politicization of Mohawk, Iroquois and Native historical perspectives within the provincial history text might include consistently identifying the 11 original nations of Quebec using their names, not general terms like Native or Amerindian, and presenting enough information to give readers a general sense of the evolution of their land base and local government structure through the period of

[23] Source: Personal communication with Anna Rizzuto, former elementary social studies teacher and instructor at McGill for social studies component of teacher education program, November 2004.

colonization. Specific information could also be provided about conflicts and cooperation with the French and English, including discussion of their motives and rationale for involvement and representation of their own accounts of historically significant events and changes, including oral history and Native authored historical sources.

The current research has pointed to the need to include Mohawk and other Native peoples' perspectives on their social, political and economic histories, which have been presented so differently in the two texts studied. The research particularly suggests a need to recognize the importance of worldview and standpoint in decisions about historical significance and approaches to historical analysis. It also suggests the need for Native perspectives of territorial histories (e.g. migrations of populations, animals, etc., and historically significant places) and of conflicts and cooperation between Native peoples, independent of European nations (e.g. the Algonquin Wars, the relations between various confederated nations). Having identified key areas of similarity and difference between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples' perspectives, there is a basis for a collaborative approach which avoids the pitfalls of bias or implicit privileging of either Native or Euro-Canadian (French or English) historical approaches.

The problem of bias in *Diverse Pasts* and *Seven Generations* was particularly evident in the discourses used, with the former being implicitly biased in favour of a Eurocentric standpoint and the latter being explicitly biased against Europeans through their negative portrayals. It is important to note that the texts may have been written in different contexts regarding the type of language and content deemed appropriate. One important convention that developed after *Seven Generations* was published and as a result of research and public opinion critical of textbook bias, is the elimination of value-laden statements, whether positive or negative, about particular nations, places, etc. *Seven Generations* does contain a number of statements that today would be charged with instilling bias in young minds by portraying history as a story with protagonists and

antagonists rather than in a neutral manner which merely states "facts". One consideration which limits the argument that history should not be portrayed through evaluative and negative assessments of certain groups is that much of the Mohawk historical account is substantiated with historical evidence and corroborated by contemporary scholarly analysis.

Although the language in *Seven Generations* could arguably be revised to be less negative and evaluative, it is unrealistic to expect a history text dealing with the legacy of colonialism to omit critical and evaluative content in favour of strictly value neutral representations. Indeed, one could argue this to be socially and politically irresponsible, if one accepts that education should play a role in the pursuit of social change and justice. However, within the field of multicultural education there are those who argue that education should be a sphere apart from politics, religion, and other aspects of life related to culture and ethnicity (Webster, 1997). Above all it should not be a place where particular political orientations can influence the direction of curriculum development and other aspects of the education system. The expectation that the study and teaching of history should remain non-partisan extends beyond high school and education ministries into universities as well, where academics who advocate Native claims risk being charged with bias and compromised objectivity, and find themselves "often struggling to maintain a non-partisan approach to what are very real and intensely partisan contemporary issues" (Coates, 2001: 112).

However, the idea that any text can accomplish the ideal of neutrality is disputable. I do think it is possible for textbooks to be more/less extreme and more/less transparent in the biases they convey. It is arguable that a more refined and subtle bias is actually worse than one that is explicit, because it is harder to detect, giving more of an illusion of neutrality. It seems that the most effective way for textbooks to uphold a standard of neutrality is to present the perspectives of multiple groups and present

students with questions for critical reflection which help them to develop their own skills of assessing and evaluating historical evidence to arrive at their own conclusions about social and political implications for history and for contemporary society.

Research has suggested that engagement with and reflection on the contradictions and injustices of society promotes students' development of cognitive sophistication, which has in turn been identified as a pedagogical priority for anti-racism education (Banks, 2001: 300-304). It is also important for citizenship education in plural societies in order to alert students to the complexities of modern societies whose structures are increasingly expected to reflect and embrace diversity. By learning about contradictions, students develop *cognitive sophistication*, a concept developed by Glock et al. in their 1975 study of adolescent prejudice, and widely used by James Banks in his work on multicultural education. Glock et al. found that "youths who are cognitively sophisticated exemplify less prejudice and discrimination than do students who lack cognitive sophistication (Banks, 2001: 300). Banks defines the concept as "the ability to think clearly about prejudice, to reason logically about it and to ask probing questions" (ibid.). For the purposes of the current study of history textbooks, cognitive sophistication could be understood as the ability of students to think clearly, reason logically, and ask probing questions about the colonial history of this nation and the impacts and fall-out for Native peoples. This suggests that the evaluative analysis of history textbooks should include attention to the manner in which students are encouraged to reflect on problems of historical interpretation and the complexity of relations between groups.

Using Banks' model of multicultural curriculum integration (see Chapter 2) to consider *Diverse Pasts*' inclusion of Native peoples' historical perspectives, the analysis suggests that *the text* falls in Level 2, the additive approach. The textbook includes some critical discussion of the contingent nature of historical interpretation at the outset,

although the critical issues of perspective and interpretation are not revisited throughout the text. Although the preliminary review of French textbooks approved for Quebec was partial and not exhaustive enough to be discussed at length, the texts tended to include sections to make students more aware of the complexity of interpreting and writing history, such as the fact that historians are influenced by their own social and historical context. However, these improvements are somewhat limited to expanding students' understanding of the theory and method of history as a discipline, not of the political and cultural contexts of knowledge production. Both *Diverse Pasts* and the French-language texts for the province still follow a linear progression from European arrival through to Confederation, positioning Indigenous peoples as allies in the early phases of history and then fading them out slowly as French Canadians became more self-sufficient. This does not reflect the transformation and social action approaches suggested in Levels 3 & 4 of Banks' model for multicultural curriculum, suggesting that further improvements are still needed to make the curriculum inclusive and reflective of Native and other bicultural students' worldviews and concerns.

Including Indigenous historical accounts in the writing of history textbooks would reduce the perpetuation of Eurocentric understandings of colonialism and its implications for Indigenous peoples. Without privileging any one system of knowledge, I would argue that multiple epistemological approaches to what counts as a truthful and legitimate knowledge should be included in debates over historical events and their significance. In the context of history education, I would advocate the importance of presenting multiple historical perspectives, as in the case of a pilot project called Brazilia Teimosa (Thompson, 1995). In this case, competing historical accounts were all included in the text used for primary school instruction, thereby validating the experience and knowledge of both the majority and minority populations, and teaching students a

valuable lesson about the contested nature of their community's heritage and cultural traditions.

Lessons & Implications for Methodology & Theory

The most important lesson taken from the analysis with regards to methodology is that the cultural differences which underlie the two orders of discourse presented in the textbooks are also related to differing worldviews and socio-political realities which produce distinct priorities, practices and values with respect to research and the production and dissemination of knowledge. This meant that it was not possible to gain access to the keepers of the knowledge and history in Kahnawake, the Elders, without first having taken the time to establish a meaningful relationship with them and earn the right to receive their contributions and sharing.

This also meant the need to remain mindful of the social context in which the Mohawk historical discourses are produced and circulated, making it impossible to assume a position of absolute impartiality and "objectivity". This research has confirmed that any research with Native communities should make a contribution to the advancement of popular awareness and knowledge about Native worldviews and perspectives on historical and contemporary social issues, because they have been suppressed and pushed aside by the knowledge producing industries housed in universities as much as they have by federal government policies and programs. Having completed the research and analysis of the two textbooks, perhaps the most challenging issue remains how to balance a liberal, multicultural curriculum which should represent all groups in a neutral light, with the reality of atrocities and injustices carried out against Native people in Canada throughout history.

The inclusion of Native-authored sources and other references recommended by Native peoples as being representative of their views on critical issues of historical and

contemporary significance relates to lessons and implications for theory and methodology. According to one interview participant, the professionals involved with the production of curriculum and teaching materials want to include more Native content for textbooks but rather than consult a Native person, they turn to a "Native expert," typically a university academic. According to this respondent, this is part of a problem of perceiving Native people as child-like, stupid, and unable to deal with advanced topics. In the context of theory and method in the social sciences, it relates to concerns expressed by Bourdieu (1971), Deloria (1994, 1997), Foucault (1983), and Smith (1999) about the way in which relations of power are expressed and reproduced through systems of knowledge production. This manifests both in the research and writing/production processes involved in developing textbooks.

Lessons & Implications for Future Research

According to Fairclough, the theoretical and empirical project of critical discourse analysis concerns itself with "how discourse figures within processes of change" (2003: 205). An important area for future research would be to consider how discourses communicated in history curriculum, including classroom teaching and textbooks, shape young peoples' awareness and understandings, if at all, of contemporary social and political issues. This research has contributed to an understanding of the differences between orders of discourse to which students of the two textbooks are exposed, but it does not contribute to an understanding of what students *do* with those representations. That is, further research on the consumption of discourses by high school students could be used to expand our understanding of the role and relative importance of textbook content for the formation of young peoples' political awareness and engagement. This is related to a need for further research on the role of history education in shaping young

peoples sense of citizenship and national identity, which have been a recent focus of the MEQ and other governments developing strategies for citizenship education to promote youth political engagement (CERN; Conseil supérieure de l'éducation, 1998). A possible theoretical approach would be to design research that could advance the empirical understanding of Foucault's theory of subjectification, or the formation of a self-identity, through discursive practices. This could contribute to work in governmentality theory on how citizenship is formed and transformed through discourses.

Implications for Policy

Will Kymlicka (1995) argues for the need for liberal political thought to embrace the legitimacy of special representation rights for indigenous groups, in their capacity as what he terms "national minorities," as well as rights to establish separate societal cultures (with institutional networks) where necessary. Although he does not explicitly address the rights of national minorities to contribute to social institutions through guaranteed representation and inclusion, such as education, this is implied by his advocacy of special rights of representation within the governmental bodies that control those institutions. His theoretical position would seem to promote representation of national minorities in the governance of education, although he discusses the protection of rights to develop separate institutions in more depth than the protection of rights to actively participate in those of the dominant society. This theoretical approach combined with the dramatic differences found between the two texts could suggest that Native people should be guaranteed representation in the committees responsible for developing and approving history curriculum and textbook content.

REFERENCES

Alfred, Gerald R. (1995) *Heeding the Voices of Our Ancestors: Kahnawake Mohawk Politics and the Rise of Native Nationalism.* Toronto, ON: Oxford University Press.

American Indian Historical Society (1970) *Textbooks and the American Indian.* San Francisco, CA: Indian Historian Press.

Apple, Michael W. (2002). *Power, Meaning & Identity: Essays in Critical Educational Studies.* New York, NY: Peter Lang Publishing.

Apple, Michael W. (1993). *Official Knowledge: Democratic Education in a Conservative Age.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Aronowitz, S. and H. Giroux (1985) *Education Under Siege.* New York, NY: Bergin & Garvey.

Assembly of First Nations & Government of Canada. *A First Nations – Federal Crown Political Accord on the Recognition and Implementation of First Nation Governments.* May 31, 2005. (http://www.afn.ca/cmslib/general/PolAcc.pdf)

Babbie, Earl and Lucia Benaquisto (2002) *Fundamentals of Social Research.* Scarborough, ON: Thomson/Nelson.

Ball, Jessica (Forthcoming). "'Nothing About Us Without Us': Restorative Research Partnership Involving Indigenous Children and Communities in Canada" in A. Farrell, ed. *Exploring Ethical Research With Children.* Berkshire, UK: Open University Press/McGraw Hill Education.

Banks, James A. and Cherry A. McGee Banks, eds. (2001) *Multicultural Education: Issues & Perspectives*, 4th edition. Toronto, ON: John Wiley & Sons.

Banks, James A. (2001) *Cultural Diversity and Education: Foundations, Curriculum and Teaching*

Battiste, Marie (1995) "Introduction" in Marie Battiste and Jean Barman, eds. *First Nations Education in Canada: The Circle Unfolds.* Vancouver, BC: UBC Press. vii-xx.

Berger, Peter L. and Thomas Luckmann (1966) *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge.* Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

Bernstein, Basil (1990) *Class, Codes and Control: Vol. IV, The Structuring of Pedagogic Discourse.* London, UK: Routledge.

Biolsi, Thomas and Larry J. Zimmerman, eds. (1997) *Indians and Anthropologists: Vine Deloria, Jr., and the Critique of Anthropology.* Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona Press.

Blanchard, David (1980) *Seven Generations: A History of the Kanienkehaka.* Kahnawake, QC: Kahnawake Survival School.

Bourdieu, Pierre (1971) "Intellectual Field and Creative Project" in M. F. D. Young, ed., *Knowledge and Control.* London, UK: Collier-Macmillan. 161-188.

Bourdieu, Pierre and Jean-Claude Passeron (1990) *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture.* 2nd edition. London, UK: Sage Publications.

Brant Castellano, Marlene (2004) "Ethics of Aboriginal Research" *Journal of Aboriginal Health* (January) 98-114.

Brown, Richard H. (1998) "Textuality and the Postmodern Turn in Sociological Theory" in Philip Smith, ed. *New American Cultural Sociology.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. 19-28.

Butler, Judith (1993) "Subjects of Sex/Gender/Desire" in S. During, ed. *The Cultural Studies Reader.* London, UK: Routledge. 340-353.

Carr, Edward Hallett (1961) *What Is History?* New York, NY: Vintage Books.

Castenell Jr., Louis A. and William F. Pinar (1993) *Understanding Curriculum As Racial Text: Representations of Identity and Difference in Education.* Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Center For World Indigenous Studies (1999) "*Draft United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples* – Draft Declaration as Agreed Upon by the Members of the Working Group at its Eleventh Session". 1994-1999. (http://www.cwis.org/drft9329.html)

CERN (Citizenship Education Research Network). "Final Report – Part 1.2.3. Towards a Research Agenda for Citizenship Education in Canada" (http://canada.metropolis.net/research-policy/cern/pub/kanan/thinktank/part123.html)

Coates, Ken (2000) "Writing First Nations into Canadian History: A Review of Recent Scholarly Works" *Canadian Historical Review* 81(1)

Cohen, Felix (1952) "Americanizing the White Man" *American Scholar* 21(2): 177-191.

Collingwood, R. G. (1946) *The Idea of History.* Oxford: Oxford UP.

Comeau, Pauline and Aldo Santin (1990) *The First Canadians: A Profile of Canada's Native People Today.* Toronto, ON: James Lorimer & Co.

Conseil supérieure de l'Éducation (1998) *Éduquer à la citoyenneté – Rapport annuel sur l'état et les besoins de l'éducation, 1997-1998.* Québec, QC: Gouvernement du Québec.

Couture, Joseph E. (1985) "Traditional Native Thinking, Feeling, and Learning: Some Thoughts on the Relationship Between Native Values and the Practice of Native Education" *Multicultural Education Journal* 3(2): 4-16.

Cruikshank, Julie (1992) "Invention of Anthropology in British Columbia's Supreme Court: Oral Tradition as Evidence in Delgamuuukw v. B.C. " *BC Studies* 95: 25-42.

----- (1994) "Oral Tradition and Oral History: Reviewing Some Issues" *The Canadian Historical Review* 75(3): 403-418.

Darder, Antonia (1991) *Culture and Power in the Classroom: Critical Foundation for Bicultural Education.* New York, NY: Bergin & Garvey.

Deer, Kenneth (1994) "Casino Referendum: The Question" *The Eastern Door* 3(11). July 1, 1994. (http://easterndoor.com/VOL.3/3-11.htm).

Deloria, Jr., Vine (1997) *Red Earth, White Lies: Native Americans and the Myth of Scientific Fact.* Golden, CO: Fulcrum Publishing.

----- (1994) *God Is Red: A Native View of Religion.* Golden, CO: Fulcrum Publishing.

Diabo, E. J. (1995) "New Membership Consultation Proposed: 'Task Force' Will Poll the Community's Opinions on the Membership Issue" *The Eastern Door* 4(21). June 23, 1995.

Dickason, Olive (1992) *Canada's First Nations: A History of Founding Peoples from Earliest Times.* Toronto, ON: McLelland & Stewart Inc.

Dickinson, John A. and Brian Young (1995) *Diverse Pasts: A History of Quebec and Canada.* 2nd ed. Toronto, ON: Copp Clark.

Dickson-Gilmore, Jane (1999) *This Is My Story, I Know Who I Am: History, Factionalist Competition and the Assumption of Imposition in Kahnawake Mohawk Nation.* Carleton University: Ethnohistory. Summer 1999, 46(3). Multicultural Module. 49.

Dimitriadis, Greg and Cameron McCarthy (2001) *Reading and Teaching the Postcolonial: From Baldwin to Basquiat and Beyond.* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Evans, Richard J. (1997) *In Defence of History.* London, UK: Granta Publishers.

Fairclough, Norman (2003) *Analysing Discourse: Textual Analysis for Social Research.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Faries, Emily and Sarah Pashgumskum (2002) *A History of Quebec and Canada.* Chisasibi, QC: Cree School Board.

Foucault, Michel (1983) "The Subject and Power" in H. L. Dreyfus and P. Rabinow, eds. *Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics.* Chicago, IL: Chicago University Press. 208-226.

Francis, Daniel (1992) *The Imaginary Indian: The Image of the Indian in Canadian Culture*. Vancouver, BC: Arsenal Pulp Press.

----- (1997) *National Dreams: Myth, Memory, and Canadian History*. Vancouver, BC: Arsenal Pulp Press.

Freire, Paulo (1997) *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York, NY: Continuum.

Frideres, James S. (1993) *Native Peoples in Canada: Contemporary Conflicts*, 4th edition.

Gilroy, Paul (1999) "Masters, Mistresses, Slaves and the Antinomies of Modernity" in A. Elliot, ed. *The Blackwell Reader in Contemporary Social Theory*. London, UK: Blackwell. 231-243.

Giroux, Henry A. (1983) *Theory and Resistance in Education*. New York, NY: Bergin & Garvey.

Gouvernement du Québec (2001) *Évaluation des Aspects Socioculturels du Matériel Didactique : Enseignement Primaire et Secondaire.* Québec, QC: Ministère de l'Éducation, Direction des Ressources Didactiques, Bureau d'Approbation des Ressources Didactiques.

Gouvernement du Québec (1997) *Reaffirming the Mission of Our Schools: A New Direction for Success - Report of the Task Force on Curriculum Reform*. Québec, QC: Ministère de l'Éducation.

Gouvernement du Québec (2001) *The State of Education in Québec*. Ministère de l'Éducation, du Loisir et du Sport. (http://www.meq.gouv.qc.ca/ETAT-GEN/MENU/EXPOSE_A/chap3.htm)

Grinde, Jr., Donald A. and Bruce E. Johansen (1991) *Exemplar of Liberty : Native America and the Evolution of Democracy*. Los Angeles, CA: American Indian Studies Center, University of California.

Hall, Stuart (1996a) "The Question of Cultural Identity" in Stuart Hall et al., eds., *Modernity: An Introduction to Modern Societies.* Cambridge, UK: Blackwell Publishers. 595-634.

----- (1996b) "The West and the Rest: Discourse and Power" in Stuart Hall et al., eds., *Modernity: An Introduction to Modern Societies*. Cambridge, UK: Blackwell Publishers. 184-228.

----- (1997). *Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices*, London, UK: Sage Publications.

Government of Canada, Indian and Northern Affairs Canada (2005) "Assembly of First Nations Leaders and Federal Ministers Meet on Joint Action for Policy Change" November 3, 2005. (http://www.ainc-inac.gc.ca/nr/prs/s-d2005/2-02729_e.html)

Indian Residential Schools Resolution Canada (2005) "Frequently Asked Questions" December 1, 2005. (http://www.irsr-rqpi.gc.ca/english/index.html).

Johansen, Bruce E. (1998) *Debating Democracy : Native American Legacy of Freedom.* Santa Fe, NM: Clear Light Publishers.

Jorgensen, Marianne W. and Louise Phillips (2002) *Discourse Analysis As Theory and Method.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Joseph, George G. et al. (1990) "Eurocentrism in Social Sciences" *Race and Class* 31(4): 1-26.

Kirby, Sandra L. and Kate McKenna (1989) *Experience Research Social Change: Methods From the Margins.* Toronto, ON : Garamond Press.

Knockwood, Isabelle (1992) *Out Of The Depths: The Experiences of Mi'kmaw Children at the Indian Residential School at Shubenacadie.* Lockeport, NS: Roseway Publishing.

Kymlicka, Will (1995) *Multicultural Citizenship: A Liberal Theory of Minority Rights.* New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Laclau, Ernesto and Chantale Mouffe (1985) *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy.* London, UK: Verso. 105-114.

Lewandowski, John (2004) "Grade 7 Textbook Fails Miserably, Native Leaders Say" *The Montreal Gazette.* September 13, 2004. Page A-10.

Lyons, Oren et al. (1992) *Exiled In the Land of the Free: Democracy, Indian Nations, and the U.S. Constitution.* Santa Fe, NM: Clear Light Publishers.

Martin, Biddy (1988) "Feminism, Criticism and Foucault" in Irene Diamond and Lee Quinby, eds. *Feminism and Foucault: Reflections on Resistance.* Boston, MA: Northeastern University Press. 3-19.

McCarthy, Cameron and Warren Crichlow, eds. (1993) *Race, Identity, and Representation in Education.* New York, NY: Routledge.

McDiarmid, Garnet & David Pratt (1971) *Teaching Prejudice: A Content Analysis of Social Studies Textbooks Authorized for Use in Ontario.* Toronto, ON: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

McGregor, Stephen (2004) *Since Time Immemorial; "Our Story".* Maniwaki, QC: Kitigan Zibi Education Council.

Mihesuah, Devon A., ed. (1998) *Natives and Academics: Researching and Writing About American Indians.* Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.

Miller, J. R. (1996) *Shingwauk's Vision: A History of Native Residential Schools.* Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.

Milloy, John S. (1999) *A National Crime: The Canadian Government and the Residential School System, 1879-1986.* Winnipeg, MB: University of Manitoba Press.

Mitchell, Terry Leigh and Emerance Baker (2005) "Community-Building Versus Career-Building Research: The Challenges, Risks, and Responsibilities of Conducting Research With Aboriginal and Native American Communities". *Journal of Cancer Education* 20(1): 41-46, supplement.

Mohawk Nation News (1998) "Can Joe Norton's Band Council Assert Sovereignty for the Mohawk Nation in Kahnawake?" June 18, 1998. (http://sisis.nativeweb.org/mohawk/jun1998.html)

Moore, Christopher (1998) "Aboriginal History, Aboriginal Historians" *Beaver* 78(5): 54-55.

Moore, Rob and Karl Maton (2001) "Founding the Sociology of Knowledge: Basil Bernstein, Intellectual Fields, and the Epistemic Device" in A. Morais et al., eds. *Towards a Sociology of Pedagogy: The Contribution of Basil Bernstein to Research.* New York, NY: Peter Lang. 153-182.

Neuendorf, Kimberly A. (2002) *The Content Analysis Guidebook.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

National Indian Brotherhood (1972) *Indian Control of Indian Education.* Ottawa, ON: National Indian Brotherhood.

Neuman, W. Lawrence (2003) *Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches,* 5th ed. Montreal, QC: Allyn and Bacon.

Newhouse, David R., Cora J. Voyageur and Dan Beavon, eds. (2005) *Hidden In Plain Sight: Contributions of Aboriginal Peoples to Canadian Identity and Culture.* Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.

O'Connor, Michael (2001) *Shifting Illusions: Historical Portrayals of Aboriginal Peoples in English Canadian High School History Textbooks, 1970-2000.* (MA Thesis, Concordia University).

Ontario Consultants on Religious Tolerance (2000) "Abuse at Native Residential Schools in Canada: Church Apologies" December 1, 2005. (http://www.religioustolerance.org/sch_resid4.htm)

Parker, Ian (1992) *Discourse Dynamics: Critical Analysis for Social and Individual Psychology.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Piquemal, N. (2000) "Four Principles to Guide Research With Aboriginals" *Policy Options* 21(10): 49-51.

Popkewitz, Thomas S. (1991) *A Political Sociology of Education Reform: Power/Knowledge in Teaching, Teacher Education, and Research.* New York, NY: Teacher's College Press.

Purvis, Trevor and Alan Hunt (1993) "Discourse, Ideology, Discourse, Ideology, Discourse, Ideology ..." *British Journal of Sociology*. London, UK: Routledge. 44(3): 473-499.

Reitsma-Street, Marge and L. Brown. (2002) "Community Action Research" in M. O'Meila and K. K. Miley, eds. *Pathways to Power: Readings in Contextual Social Work Practice*. Toronto, ON: Allyn & Bacon. 74-94.

Reynolds, Graham (2000) "Teaching First Nations History as Canadian History" *Canadian Social Studies* 34(3, Spring)

Richardson, Boyce, ed. (1989) *Drum Beat: Anger and Renewal in Indian Country*. Toronto, ON: Summer Hill Press, Assembly of First Nations.

Ross, Alistair (2001) *Curriculum: Construction & Critique*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Rush, Stuart (2003) "Use of Oral History in Aboriginal Rights Litigation" The Continuing Legal Education Society of British Columbia. December 29, 2003. (http://www.cle.bc.ca/Cle/Practice+Desk/Practice+Articles/Collection/02-app-oralhistoryevidence)

Sardar, Ziauddin (1999) "Development and the Locations of Eurocentrism" in Ronaldo Munck and Denis O'Hearn, eds. *Critical Development Theory: Contributions To A New Paradigm*. New York, NY: Zed Books.

Satzewich, Vic and Terry Wotherspoon (2000) *First Nations: Race, Class, and Gender Relations*. Regina, SK: Canadian Plains Research Centre.

Sayyid, S. (2000) "Bad Faith: Anti-Essentialism, Universalism and Islamism" in A. Brah and A. Coombes, eds. *Hybridity and Its Discontents*. New York, NY: Routledge. 257-271.

Schissel, Bernard and Terry Wotherspoon (2003) *The Legacy of School for Aboriginal People: Education, Oppression, and Emancipation*. Toronto, ON: Oxford University Press.

Schnarch, Brian (2004) "Ownership, Control, Access, and Possession (OCAP) or Self-Determination Applied To Research" *Journal of Aboriginal Health* 1(1). 80-95.

Schofield, Janet Ward (2001) "The Colorblind Perspective in School: Causes and Consequences" in James A. Banks and Cherry A. McGee Banks, eds. *Multicultural Education: Issues & Perspectives*, 4th edition. Toronto, ON: John Wiley & Sons. 247-267.

Sinclair, Jennifer (2004) "Family Risks" Panel. *New Centuries, New Risks: Challenges for Social Development in Canada* Conference. McGill University, Montreal, QC. November 18, 2004.

Sioui, Georges E. (1992) *For an Amerindian Autohistory: An Essay on the Foundations of a Social Ethic*. Montreal, QC: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Sleeter, Christine E. and Peter McLaren, eds. (1995) *Multicultural Education, Critical Pedagogy, and the Politics of Difference.* Albany, NY: State University of New York.

Sleeter, Christine E. and Dolores Delgado Bernal (2004) "Critical Pedagogy, Critical Race Theory, and Antiracist Education: Implications for Multicultural Education" in James A. Banks and Cherry A. McGee Banks, eds. *Handbook of Research on Multicultural Education*, 2nd ed. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Smith, Dan (1993) *The Seventh Fire: The Struggle for Aboriginal Self-Government.* Toronto, ON: Key Porter Books.

Smith, Linda Tuhiwai (1999) *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples.* New York, NY: Zed Books.

Sunseri, L. (2000). "Moving Beyond the Feminism Versus Nationalism Dichotomy; An Anti-Colonial Feminist Perspective on Aboriginal Liberation Struggles". *Canadian Woman Studies* 20(2): 143-148.

Thompson, Paul (1995) "Community History and Mobilization: Recife, Brazil" in Hugo Slim and Paul Thompson, eds. *Listening for a Change: Oral Testimony and Community Development.* Gabriola Island, BC: New Society Publishers. 104-115.

Thompson, Willie (2000) *What Happened to History?* Sterling, VA: Pluto Press.

Trigger, Bruce G. (1985) *Natives and Newcomers: Canada's "Heroic Age" Reconsidered.* Montreal, QC: McGill-Queen's UP.

----- (1986) "The Historian's Indian: Native Americans in Canadian Historical Writing from Charlevoix to the Present" *Canadian Historical Review* 63(3)

UNESCO (1996) *Atlas of the World's Languages in Danger of Disappearing*, ed. Stephen A. Wurm.

Van Dijk, Teun A. (1993) "Principles of Critical Discourse Analysis" *Discourse & Society* 4(2): 249-283. London, UK: Sage.

----- (1996) "Discourse, Power and Access" in Carmen Rosa Caldas-Coulthard and Malcolm Coulthard, eds. *Texts and Practices: Readings in Critical Discourse Analysis.* New York, NY: Routledge. 84-104.

Vincent, Sylvie and Bernard Arcand. (1979) *L'image de l'Amérindien dans les manuels scolaires: ou, Comment les Québécois ne sont pas des sauvages.* Montreal, QC: Hurtubise HMH.

Von Gernet, Alexander (----) "What My Elders Taught Me: Oral Traditions as Evidence in Aboriginal Litigation" in *Beyond the Nass Valley.* 103-129. December 1, 2005. (http://epe.lac-bac.gc.ca/100/200/300/fraser/beyond_the_nass_valley/1_basics/07vonGERNET.pdf).

Washburn, Wilcomb E. and Bruce C. Trigger (1996) "Native Peoples in Euro-American Historiography" in *The Cambridge History of the Native Peoples of the Americas, Vol. I*

Weatherford, Jack (1992) *Native Roots : How the Indians Enriched America*. New York, NY : Fawcett Columbine.

Webster, Yehudi O. (1997) *Against the Multicultural Agenda: A Critical Thinking Alternative.* Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.

York, Geoffrey (1990) *The Dispossessed: Life and Death in Native Canada*. London, UK: Vintage U.K.

York, Geoffrey and Loreen Pindera (1991) *People of the Pines: The Warriors and the Legacy of Oka*. Boston, MA: Little & Brown.

APPENDIX A

FIRST NATIONS HISTORICAL REPRESENTATIONS

IN QUEBEC

HIGH SCHOOL TEXTBOOKS

INTERVIEW GUIDE

Angela Briscoe
September 2004

Introduction

Welcome, thank you for coming. As you know my name is Angela Briscoe, I'm a graduate student in Sociology at Concordia University. This interview is part of my thesis research, in which I am comparing different representations of Aboriginal peoples' roles in Quebec & Canadian history and how they have been affected by the presence of European, Québécois and Canadian societies.

For this interview, I am interested in your ideas about how best to represent Aboriginal peoples and their histories in high school textbooks. In order to learn about your perspective and the context you are coming from, the interview is made up of three sections.

1. First, I will ask you about your recollections & perceptions of history education when you were a student.

2. Second, I'll ask you about your perceptions of necessary textbook content by asking your thoughts about the information that you think should be provided about a number of topics or themes.

3. Finally, I'll ask for some additional information about your group membership, age, and education.

Sign consent form.

First Nations Historical Representations in Quebec High School Textbooks
Consent Form

A. Purpose:

I have been informed that the purpose of the research is to compare various perspectives on representations of Aboriginal peoples' histories in Quebec high school textbooks. I understand that the information gathered during interviews will be used for the preparation of a master's thesis on this topic. This consent form does not grant permission to use the information that I provide during the interview for any other purposes. Should anyone wish to use the information for other purposes, they must ask my permission first.

B. Procedures:

I have been informed that the research will involve one 60-90 minute interview, with possible follow-up questions by telephone. I understand that the interviews will be recorded on audio cassettes (which will be kept by the researcher for 2 years), and that hand-written notes and recordings of the interviews will be accessible only to the researcher and her thesis committee (consisting of 3 individuals).

I understand that measures will be taken to ensure that my identity is kept confidential; all notes and recordings made available to committee members will be identified only by a numbered code and the date of the interview. I also understand that I may choose not to answer a question during the interview, and that I am free to discontinue the interview at any time.

I am aware that I can contact the following people if I have any questions or concerns:

Angela Briscoe, Researcher – (514) 259-8182 or angebriscoe@yahoo.co.uk
Dr. Bill Reimer, Supervisor – (514) 848-2424, ext. 2171 or reimer@vax2.concordia.ca

C. Conditions of participation:

- I understand that I am free to withdraw my consent and discontinue my participation at any time without negative consequences.
- I understand that my participation in this study in CONFIDENTIAL (i.e. the researcher will know but not disclose my identity).
- I understand that the data from this study may be published or otherwise disseminated to report on the research findings.
- I understand the purpose of this study and know that there is no hidden motive of which I have not been informed.

I have carefully studied the above and understand this agreement. I freely consent and agree to participate in this study.

Name: _____ Signature: _____

Researcher signature: _____ Date: _____

Introduction, continued

1. Do you have any questions for me before we begin the interview?
   OPT *about consent form
   OPT *about what's expected of you

Section 1 - Recollections & Perceptions of History Education

This section is about your experience of history education in school and informally with your family and other community members. I'd like you to think back to your youth up to and including high school.

2. Where did you attend high school?
   REQ * in Quebec?
   REQ * Aboriginal or provincially-run?
   REQ * were there (other) Aboriginal students in your class? At your school?
3. Do you remember studying history of Quebec & Canada? [yes/no]
4. Did you enjoy it? What did you like or dislike about it?
5. What do you remember learning in school about the arrival of Europeans and the founding of Canada?
   REQ * Aboriginal peoples' roles?
6. Outside of school, where else do you remember learning history?
   REQ * family, friends, community members - who in particular?
   REQ * books, movies, museums, other?
   OPT * about family history?
   OPT * about regional, provincial, national history?
7. What do you remember learning about the arrival of Europeans and the founding of Quebec & Canada?
   a) from your family, friends and community members?
   b) from books, movies, museums?
   c) from other contexts outside of school?

TEXTBOOKS

As you (may) know, there are 4 textbooks currently approved for teaching the HIST 414 course (History of Quebec & Canada) in Quebec high schools. Here they are.
[Give respondent sheet with textbook covers & titles AND/OR present hard copies of texts]

8. Can you tell me which of these textbooks, if any, you are familiar with?
   [IF NO TEXTS → Skip to Next Section]
9. a) How did you come to be familiar with [1st text]? (Probe for details).
      REQ * read for school / work
      REQ * read with children for school
      REQ * heard about it from others who read for school / work
      REQ * other
   b) [Repeat for 2nd text]
   c) [Repeat for 3rd text]
   d) [Repeat for 4th text]

10. Considering that history texts, like other texts, can do good and bad jobs of representing history and different groups perspectives, can you tell me whether, *in your opinion*, the information provided in the texts you're familiar with is representative of Aboriginal perspectives?
    a. Starting with [Text # 1], in what ways do you think it represents or misrepresents Aboriginal perspectives of history & contemporary society?
    b. And in what ways do you think [Text # 2] represents or misrepresents Aboriginal perspectives of history & contemporary society?
    c. And in what ways do you think [Text # 3] represents or misrepresents Aboriginal perspectives of history & contemporary society?
    d. And in what ways do you think [Text # 4] represents or misrepresents Aboriginal perspectives of history & contemporary society?

Section 2 – Perceptions of Necessary Textbook Content

The next section will be about what information you consider most important for history textbooks to represent Aboriginal peoples' roles and experiences in history and contemporary society. (Again) I am interested in your opinions and there are no right or wrong answers.

11. Imagine that you are responsible for designing a history textbook to teach students about the history of Quebec & Canada. Can you LIST TOPICS that should be included about Aboriginal peoples' roles in history and contemporary society? [Max. 10 items]
    REQ * what might you change or keep from current texts? Count to 10
    REQ * historical events & social, cultural, political changes to be included?
12. What information do you think the text should provide about:
    a. [1st topic listed]? (Repeat probes)
    b. What information should the text provide about [2nd topic listed]?
    c. What information should the text provide about [3rd topic listed]?
    d. What information should the text provide about [4th topic listed]?
    e. What information should the text provide about [5th topic listed]?
    f. What information should the text provide about [6th topic listed]?
    g. What information should the text provide about [7th topic listed]?
    h. What information should the text provide about [8th topic listed]?
    i. What information should the text provide about [9th topic listed]?
    j. What information should the text provide about [10th topic listed]?
13. I'd like to ask you a few more questions about some topics that you may not have mentioned yet, but I'd like you to continue to imagine that you are including them in the textbook you are designing.
    a. What information, if any, should be included in the text about the DIVERSITY of Aboriginal peoples?
    b. What information, if any, should be included in the text about Aboriginal peoples' MATERIAL CULTURE?
    c. What information, if any, should be included in the text about Aboriginal peoples' SOCIAL ORGANIZATION?

d. What information, if any, should be included in the text about Aboriginal peoples' RELIGIOUS & PHILOSOPHICAL TRADITIONS?
e. What information, if any, should be included in the text about TERRITORIAL CLAIMS by Aboriginal peoples?
f. What information, if any, should be included in the text about TERRITORIAL CLAIMS by Europeans?
g. What information, if any, should be included in the text about ECONOMIC RELATIONS (Aboriginal-European)?
h. What information, if any, should be included in the text about CROSS-CULTURAL INFLUENCES (Aboriginal-European)?
i. What information, if any, should be included in the text about the LEGAL STATUS of Aboriginal peoples since the founding of the federal & provincial governments [since Confederation]?

14. Can you tell me if there are any CONTEMPORARY SOCIAL ISSUES affecting Aboriginal communities that you think should be addressed in textbooks?
    REQ * Any others? [List of max. 5 items]
15. What information do you think the text should provide about:
    a. [1st item listed]?
    b. What information should the text provide about [2nd item listed]?
    c. What information should the text provide about [3rd item listed]?
    d. What information should the text provide about [4th item listed]?
    e. What information should the text provide about [5th item listed]?
16. What are your thoughts about oral history:
    a. As a source of historical data for writing textbooks?
    b. As a way of teaching history? Is it a useful pedagogical approach?
17. I just have two last questions regarding textbook content before the final section:
    a. How would you define "colonialism" or "colonization" for 16 year old students?
    b. Is there anything else that you think should be included in textbooks that we have not discussed?

We've almost reached the end of the interview. At this point I want to thank you again for offering your time to participate. Just before finishing I'd like to ask for a bit more information about your socio-economic and cultural background, and your contact with Aboriginal communities.

Section 3 - Additional Information

18. What is your current job (title, organization)? Since when?
19. What job did you have before that? For how long?
20. **CERD members ONLY:**
    a. What position do you fill on the committee?
    b. Since when?
    c. What is your ethnicity? (How many generations in Canada?)
21. **First Nations ONLY:**
    a. What is your ethnicity? To which nation(s) do you belong?
    b. Geographic location?

22. Education In progress (level):
    Highest level completed:
23. In the last 3 months, how often were you in contact with Aboriginal people? (daily, weekly, monthly)
    REQ * Face-to-face, telephone, internet or other communication?
    REQ * Personal or professional relationship?
24. Is this a typical amount of contact for you? [yes/no >explain]
    OPT * more than usual, less than usual
25. Did you have the same amount & type of contact with Aboriginal people in your life FIVE years ago? [yes/no >explain]
    OPT * were you living in the same community?
    OPT * anything different about employment or social situation?

Year of birth:
Gender:
Other referrals?
Permission to follow-up: Phone: yes / no Email: yes / no